

# JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Volume XVIII

MARCH 1948

Number 7

## *State Superintendents for the Community College*

### EDITORIAL

A GIANT stride forward in policy touching the junior college was taken at its annual meeting, held in December in Los Angeles, by the National Council of Chief State School Officers. At one of its sessions it gave approval to a report made by the Subcommittee on Education for the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Years to the Planning Committee of the Council—a report that had been prepared under the leadership, as chairman of the subcommittee, of Dr. J. Cayce Morrison, assistant commissioner for research of the New York State Education Department. The subcommittee had been asked to formulate a statement concerning the state's responsibilities and opportunities for the expansion and improvement of educational services at the school level identified in its name. In the brief space here available, the position taken by the report and by the organization of state superintendents through approving it can best be given by paraphrasing the policies set down.

1. The groups of students for which programs should be provided are the five identified by the Educational Policies Commission in *Education for All American Youth*. The students, as previously indicated in these columns, would be (a) those wanting preparation for various technical and semi-professional occupations which require all the training that high schools can give and one or two years in addition; (b) those wanting advanced training beyond that which can be offered in the years of the high school in the occupations for which high schools provide basic preparation; (c) those wanting to prepare for admission to professional schools and the last two years of technical and liberal arts colleges; (d) those wanting to round out their general education before entering employment or becoming homemakers; and (e) adults and older youth, mostly employed, who wish to continue their education during their free hours.

2. The new institutions should be named "community colleges" or "community institutes" to indicate the broad functions they are to serve. The opinion is expressed that the name "junior college" has become a distinct liability because it tends to concentrate the thinking of students, faculty, and

patrons on the university-preparatory curriculum to the exclusion of the terminal function.

3. Public community colleges or institutes should be under the general supervision of the state department of education in the same way as are elementary and high schools.

4. With due regard for the quality of programs and economy of operation, community colleges should be located within commuting distance of all youth of the state.

5. Such reorganization of school districts should be effected as will give units of sufficient size to justify organization of a community college or institute.

6. The law should provide for integration or close articulation of community-college programs with the supporting high-school programs. Unfavorable reference is made in the report to enabling legislation in some states which is directed to the thirteenth and fourteenth years only and which makes difficult, if not impossible, integration of high-school and community-college programs.

7. The state should establish criteria governing the location of community colleges.

8. The state department should establish standards governing approval and placement of curriculums.

9. Development of a program of community-college or institute education should give due regard to existing privately supported institutions.

10. The state should foster and encourage a program for the preparation of teachers for service in public community colleges and institutes.

11. The community college or in-

stitute should be tuition-free and, so far as possible, remove or reduce the economic barrier to education. Free transportation should be provided and, for students living beyond commuting distance, a subsistence allowance or scholarship approximately equal to the average cost per student of transportation.

12. Enabling legislation should encourage, through adequate financial support, the establishment of community-college or institute programs, and state aid should be distributed on an equalization basis.

Cautious readers will not need to be warned against inferring that approval of these policies by the national association of state superintendents is the same thing as putting community-college programs in operation in all commonwealths of the nation. It must, at best, be a long and tortuous road from such commitment on policies to the consummation of adequate systems of institutions to carry out the policies. Nevertheless, this approval in the year 1947 impresses as a major advance in the junior-college movement when one calls to mind that the policy has crystallized out of the experience of a single generation, at the beginning of which establishment of these new institutions was almost strictly a matter of scattered enterprise and local initiative.

LEONARD V. KOOS



## *Administrative and Supervisory Practices for Improving Instruction. III*

JOSEPH B. DAVIS

DURING 1947 a survey of administrative and supervisory practices for improving instruction was completed by the Research Office of the American Association of Junior Colleges. The December and the January issues of the *Junior College Journal* contained reports of a part of the material from this large survey. This article is the third of a series of three articles and presents the results of the evidence gathered on the sections of the total report assigned for report and further study to the Committee on Teacher Preparation. These four fields are (1) instructor ratings, (2) inter-visitation practices, (3) demonstration teaching, and (4) policies of institutions regarding encouragement of advanced study.

### *Instructor Ratings*

Information regarding the number of junior colleges making use of ratings of instructors, as revealed

---

JOSEPH B. DAVIS is dean of Amarillo College, Texas, and acting chairman of the Committee on Teacher Preparation of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

by the study of the office of the Director of Research, is summarized in Table 1. Of 228 junior colleges from which replies were received, instructors are rated in only 45—about one out of five. As might be expected, teacher ratings are used more widely in the large schools (23.2 per cent) than in the small colleges (16.4 per cent). An exception to this is found in the case of the 14 private junior colleges using ratings, where the percentage of large schools using the ratings is slightly less than that of the small schools. This exception is more than balanced, however, by the fact that, among the 31 public junior colleges giving ratings to teachers, a much greater tendency to make use of ratings is found in the large schools. Teacher ratings are found to be more prevalent in public junior colleges, where approximately one school in every four makes use of such ratings as compared with about one in seven of the private colleges.

The purposes cited for rating instructors are, in order of frequency: (1) to serve as a basis for discussion toward improvement of teach-

ing, (2) to provide a basis for salary promotion, and (3) to aid in determination of tenure status. It is interesting to note that the same order of frequency of these purposes is found for all types of junior colleges—public or private, large or small. Thirty-nine of the 45 colleges (86.7 per cent) use the ratings as

the practice is almost universal in junior colleges having enrolments of more than 300; 98.2 per cent of these colleges report intervisitation by instructors. Since only 64.7 per cent of the small junior colleges report some practice of intervisitation, the percentage for all institutions that responded to the study is

TABLE 1.—JUNIOR COLLEGES MAKING USE OF RATINGS OF INSTRUCTORS

Classification*	Number Responding to Study	Number Not Answering Question	Colleges Using Ratings		Colleges Not Using Ratings	
			Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Public:						
Small .....	48	1	9	18.8	38	79.2
Large .....	78	3	22	28.2	53	68.0
Total .....	126	4	31	24.6	91	72.2
Private:						
Small .....	68	2	10	14.7	56	82.4
Large .....	34	1	4	11.8	29	85.3
Total .....	102	3	14	13.7	85	83.3
Public and private:						
Small .....	116	3	19	16.4	94	81.0
Large .....	112	4	26	23.2	82	73.2
Total .....	228	7	45	19.7	176	77.2

\* For purposes of this study, small institutions include those with fewer than 300 students; large junior colleges, those with 300 or more students.

a basis for discussion toward improvement of teaching, 48.9 per cent for salary promotion, and 13.3 per cent for determination of tenure status. Almost all the colleges using ratings as a basis for salary promotion also use them for improvement of teaching.

#### *Intervisitation Practices*

Intervisitation is found to be much more widely used as a means of improving instruction than is the practice of rating teachers. In fact,

81.1. The practice is found to be widespread in all large schools, whether public (98.7 per cent) or private (97.1 per cent), but it is considerably more prevalent in the small public junior colleges (77.1 per cent) than in the small private junior colleges (55.9 per cent). Thus 90.5 per cent of the public junior colleges and 69.6 per cent of the private institutions report intervisitation.

Table 2 shows the number of junior colleges reporting intervisita-

tion practices and indicates the types of classes, schools, or agencies visited. According to these schedules, visits prevalent in the largest number of junior colleges, in order of frequency, are to high schools supplying students to the institutions, to other junior colleges, and to senior-college and university classes. Other visits are made to

senior-college and university classes; and the fourth largest, to classes in the same department. The order in which these items rank in the private junior college is (1) high schools supplying students to the institutions, (2) senior college and university classes, (3) classes in the same department, and (4) other junior colleges.

TABLE 2.—INTERVISITATION PRACTICES FOLLOWED IN 116 SMALL AND 112 LARGE JUNIOR COLLEGES

<i>Practice Cited</i>	<i>Small Colleges*</i>	<i>Large Colleges†</i>	<i>All Colleges</i>
Colleges reporting some practice of intervisitation by instructors:			
Number .....	75	110	185
Per cent .....	64.7	98.2	81.1
Instructors visit:			
1. High schools supplying students to the institutions	44	26	70
2. Other junior colleges .....	31	31	62
3. Senior-college and university classes .....	30	30	60
4. Classes in same department .....	19	34	53
5. Agencies employing junior-college graduates .....	21	30	51
6. Classes in other departments .....	11	20	31
7. Others .....	1	2	3
8. None .....	10	19	29

\* The small institutions include 48 public colleges; 68 private colleges; total, 116.

† The large institutions include 78 public colleges; 34 private colleges; total, 112.

classes in the same department, to agencies employing junior-college graduates, and to classes in other departments.

It is interesting to note a difference in emphasis between public and private junior colleges, as indicated by the frequencies with which the first four items listed above are reported. The largest number of public junior colleges report intervisitation to other junior colleges; the next largest, to high schools supplying students to the institutions; the third largest, to

The schedules do not reveal whether the chief purpose of the visits to high schools supplying students to the institutions is to recruit students, to co-ordinate the work offered, to improve instruction in the junior college, or to achieve some other purpose. They seem to indicate, however, that the public junior colleges are paying considerable attention to what other junior colleges are doing, while the private institutions are looking more to the senior colleges and universities. In the large

schools, both private and public, visitation of classes in the same department ranks high, while in small colleges the instructors are more likely to visit high schools.

Junior colleges reporting visitation practices indicate an extremely large range in the number of visits made by instructors. In the small colleges the number per semester ranges from 1 to 100, with a median of 5, while in the large colleges the range is from 1 to 200, with a median of 10. The median number of visits for all schools is 6. The most frequent visits are to agencies employing junior-college graduates (the median number of such visits being 19), visits to classes in the same department (median, 10), visits to high schools supplying students to the institution (median, 10), visits to classes in other departments (median, 8), visits to senior-college and university classes (median, 5), and visits to other junior colleges (median, 4). Thus it is seen that, although many junior colleges report the practice of visiting other junior colleges and senior colleges and universities, the median number of visits made by members of a faculty is lower in these two types of visitation than in any of the other four listed.

Table 3 lists five policies followed to encourage intervisitation. It is to be noted that the base for this table differs from that of Table 2. In Table 2, the number of junior colleges reporting intervisitation prac-

tices is used, while in Table 3 the total number of respondents to the study is taken as the base.

It is found that approximately two junior colleges out of every five follow the practice of encouraging intervisitation by allowing time without salary reduction, nearly a third supply the cost of travel, and a seventh provide a substitute instructor. No consistent differences in the policies of encouraging intervisitation appear between public and private junior colleges. The practice is considerably more prevalent in small public schools than in small private schools, but, in general, it is more prevalent in large private schools than in large public schools. This statement is especially true in the case of supplying the cost of travel, where 41.2 per cent of the large private junior colleges and only 24.4 per cent of the large public schools meet this cost.

A study of the follow-up procedures used in intervisitation practices reveals that few schools (not more than 22 of the 185 institutions reporting such practices) require written reports of visits. In most colleges, however, an oral report is made. Twelve schools require a written report to the dean or president; five, to the faculty as a whole; two, to the department head; one, to the department staff; and two, written reports of another type. Oral reports to the dean or president are required in 81 schools; to the faculty as a whole, in 65; to

the department head, in 23; and to the department staff, in 13. Twenty-five schools require oral reports to the faculty as a whole, in addition to the oral reports made to the dean or president. No significant differences appear between procedures of private and public

to require the reports to the faculty as a whole and to the dean or president.

### *Demonstration Teaching*

It is found that demonstration teaching is used in only 13, or 5.7 per cent of the 228 junior colleges,

TABLE 3.—POLICIES FOLLOWED BY 116 SMALL AND 112 LARGE JUNIOR COLLEGES TO ENCOURAGE INTERVISITATION

<i>Policy</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Time allowed without salary reduction:		
Small colleges .....	41	35.3
Large colleges .....	48	42.9
All colleges .....	89	39.0
Cost of travel supplied:		
Small colleges .....	33	28.4
Large colleges .....	34	30.4
All colleges .....	67	29.4
Substitute instructor provided:		
Small colleges .....	15	12.9
Large colleges .....	18	16.1
All colleges .....	33	14.5
Teacher visits on own free time:		
Small colleges .....	4	3.4
Large colleges .....	4	3.6
All colleges .....	8	3.5
No set policy maintained:		
Small colleges .....	11	9.5
Large colleges .....	7	6.3
All colleges .....	18	7.9
No answer to question:		
Small colleges .....	52	44.8
Large colleges .....	52	46.4
All colleges .....	104	45.6

schools. There is a noticeable difference between large and small schools, however: the large schools tend to require more oral reports to department heads and department staffs, while the small schools tend

divided almost equally between public and private institutions, and also between large and small colleges. Although as many small colleges as large colleges provided demonstration lessons, the number



of demonstration lessons taught during the first semester of 1946-47 is much greater in the large colleges than in the small ones. The number in the large colleges ranged from 10 to 100, with a median of 12, compared with a range of 1 to 12 in the small colleges, with a median of 3. The number of teachers observing the lessons was somewhat greater in the large colleges (median, 15) than in the small schools (median, 9), and it was considerably greater in the public schools (median, 17.5) than in the private schools (median, 6.5).

The demonstration lessons were presented in twelve departments, including those subjects commonly studied in liberal arts, sciences, fine arts, and terminal fields. They were most often presented in the fields of physical science, education, and English. In most institutions the demonstration teachers were selected by the administrative or supervisory personnel, although in several cases the selection was made by the department head. The department staff sometimes co-operated in planning the demonstration. The follow-up procedures included discussion by the whole faculty in about half of the cases, and discussion by the department concerned in the other half. As might be expected, the demonstration lessons were usually discussed by the whole faculty in the small junior colleges, and by the department concerned in the large schools.

#### *Encouragement of Advanced Study*

The study indicates that 93 per cent of the junior colleges have a definite policy of encouraging advanced study and travel by instructors and that instructors are, in general, actually using these avenues of improvement. In Table 4 data are presented showing the extent to which several avenues of study are encouraged by junior colleges and used by instructors. Of the 228 colleges, 170 report that they encourage their instructors to attend summer-session courses in colleges and universities, while 176 colleges report that their instructors are actually attending summer-session courses; 125 schools encourage use of extension courses, and 108 have instructors taking them; 82 encourage travel related to instructors' specialties, and 72 report that such travel is being done; 47 provide sabbatical leaves for study, while 35 report such leaves; 41 grant other special leaves for study, and 35 have instructors taking these leaves.

In general, these policies and practices are prevalent in higher percentages of the large junior colleges than of the small institutions. This is especially true in the case of sabbatical leaves and other special leaves for study, which are taken by approximately three times as many teachers in large schools as in small schools. The differences in practice in the private and the pub-

lic junior colleges are not particularly significant, although in public junior colleges larger percentages of teachers take sabbatical leaves and extension courses than in private colleges, and in private junior colleges the teachers are somewhat more likely to take advantage of

TABLE 4.—AVENUES OF ADVANCED STUDY AND TRAVEL FOR INSTRUCTORS ENCOURAGED BY 116 SMALL AND 112 LARGE JUNIOR COLLEGES REPORTING ACTUAL USE OF THE AVENUES BY INSTRUCTORS

<i>Avenue of Advancement</i>	<i>Colleges Encouraging Avenue</i>		<i>Colleges in Which Instructors Use Avenue</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Summer-session courses in colleges and universities:				
Small colleges .....	82	70.7	86	74.1
Large colleges .....	88	78.6	90	80.4
All colleges .....	170	74.6	176	77.2
Extension courses of colleges and universities:				
Small colleges .....	52	44.8	46	39.7
Large colleges .....	73	65.2	62	55.4
All colleges .....	125	54.8	108	47.4
Travel related to instructors' specialties:				
Small colleges .....	37	31.9	33	28.4
Large colleges .....	45	40.2	39	34.8
All colleges .....	82	36.0	72	31.6
Sabbatical leaves for study:				
Small colleges .....	17	14.7	8	6.9
Large colleges .....	30	26.8	27	24.1
All colleges .....	47	20.6	35	15.4
Other special leaves for study:				
Small colleges .....	11	9.5	9	7.8
Large colleges .....	30	26.8	26	23.2
All colleges .....	41	18.0	35	15.4
Others:				
Small colleges .....	4	3.4	5	4.3
Large colleges .....	2	1.8	2	1.8
All colleges .....	6	2.6	7	3.1
None:				
Small colleges .....	4	3.4	.....	.....
Large colleges .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
All colleges .....	4	1.8	.....	.....
No answer to question:				
Small colleges .....	8	6.9	8	6.9
Large colleges .....	4	3.6	4	3.6
All colleges .....	12	5.3	12	5.3

travel related to their specialties than are teachers in public junior colleges.

The schedules also include a tabulation of replies showing how many junior colleges recognize advanced study by providing salary increases or differentials. Although the tabulation of these replies is not reproduced here, replies relating to this question were received from 163 schools, 156 of which recognize advanced study in determining salaries. Of these, 141 give recognition to the attainment of higher degrees; 83 recognize credit earned in advanced courses; and 16 recognize other avenues, such as research, writings, community service, and work experience. Sixty-eight of these schools indicate that they take into consideration both "attainment of higher degrees" and "credit earned in advanced courses." In both of these items the large schools, whether private or public, apparently are more likely to give recognition than the small schools.

In the case of the third item, in which are grouped "research, writings, community service, work experience, etc.," the large public schools tend to give recognition to a greater extent than do the small public colleges, but the opposite tendency is found in private schools, where eight small schools and only one large school report recognition for one or more of these

items. Because of the small number of cases and because of the diversity of services included in the item, the data are not sufficient for drawing valid conclusions, but they suggest the interesting possibility that the small junior college may place more importance on community service, writings, or some other indication of alertness and initiative than does the large college.

Examples of other administrative practices for improvement of instruction, although reported by only a few institutions, are: (1) submission to the faculty of data from a test analysis of student-body characteristics; (2) provision of lecture series, clinics, and workshops attended by faculty groups; (3) distribution of instructional literature in the faculty mail; (4) annual money grants for articles published in professional magazines; and (5) payment of tuition of certain individuals for attendance at universities for advanced study in their special fields.

### *Concluding Comments*

The data assembled by the Research Office and summarized in this and previous issues of the *Junior College Journal*<sup>1</sup> contain a

<sup>1</sup> a) James W. Reynolds, "Administrative and Supervisory Practices for Improving Instruction. I," *Junior College Journal*, XVIII (December, 1947), 181-90.

b) John E. Gray, "Administrative and Supervisory Practices for Improving Instruction. II," *Junior College Journal*, XVIII (January, 1948), 238-46.

great deal of information regarding present practices for improving junior-college instruction. In their present form, however, they do not offer an evaluation of these practices. If the collection and interpretation of this information is to result in improved instruction, it is essential that further study of many of these practices be made in order that they may be evaluated.

Certain limitations may be noted in a few of the tabulations, where the small number of responses precludes valid interpretation. Nevertheless, further study may be desirable even in these cases. The fact that a certain procedure is practiced in only a few schools is not necessarily evidence that the procedure is undesirable. For example, since demonstration teaching is found in only one out of every

eighteen junior colleges, it might be particularly helpful to study practices in several individual institutions, including follow-up procedures and an evaluation of the practices as a means of improving instruction. Similarly, further study should be given to specific practices in junior colleges where successful programs of intervisitation are in operation, where classroom experimentation is regarded as particularly helpful in promoting better instruction, or where any other practice is widely used.

The next step, therefore, is to evaluate the many administrative and supervisory practices for which data are available, to determine how successfully their purposes are being achieved, and how procedures may be modified to effect instructional improvement.

## *Trends in Semiprofessional Curriculum*

JOHN M. BECK

**J**UNIOR colleges, to serve the divergent needs of a rapidly expanding student population, are increasingly providing flexible and adaptable programs of terminal education. It was the purpose of this study to examine the extent to which prescription in the junior-college curriculum has been supplemented by nonacademic course groups. Junior-college catalogues were analyzed for curricular offerings culminating at the end of two years in preparation for entrance into a nonprofessional or semiprofessional occupation.

The initial basis for comparison was a curricular analysis of seventy-five junior colleges made by Schuytema for the two years 1925 and 1935.<sup>1</sup> Data for these same junior colleges in 1938-39 were assembled from Eells.<sup>2</sup> Finally, similar data were tabulated from junior-college catalogues for years ranging from 1943 to 1947.

JOHN M. BECK is at present doing graduate work in the Department of Education of the University of Chicago and serving as a part-time teacher at the Faulkner School in Chicago.

Forty-three public junior colleges and thirty-two private junior colleges are represented. Of the forty-three public junior colleges, the selection characterized mainly those administered by local units.

Geographically, the Middle West with forty-one junior colleges, public and private, is the largest group. Nineteen colleges are in the West; twelve, in California alone. Fifteen, all privately controlled, are located in the East.

The trend in semiprofessional curriculums is analyzed in two ways: first, by the total number of offerings during each of the four periods in the span of twenty-two years; second, by the average number of semiprofessional curriculums per junior college for the corresponding intervals.

It is admitted that some increases are inflationary, for government policy during the depression and

<sup>1</sup> Guy L. Schuytema, "Curriculum Trends at the Junior-College Level in Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1940.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Crosby Eells, *Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education*, p. 212. Terminal Education Monograph No. 2. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.



during the war was favorable to curricular extension in vocational areas. However, the impact of technology on industry must also be taken into consideration. For example, new fields of work have been created in engineering, and this development has raised the ratio of the semiprofessional workers to engineers from 2.7 to 1 in 1931 to 5.2 to 1 in 1944.<sup>3</sup> Even discounting any unusual stimuli, the data appear significant and indicate a greater emphasis on terminal education.

*Comparison of Public and Private Colleges*

**PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES.**—In Table 1 facts are first presented for all selected junior colleges. For the total group the number of semiprofessional curriculums offered rose from 82 to 565—a gain of more than 400 curriculums in approximately twenty years. The average per junior college increased from 1.09 to 7.74. In part, this giant growth can be attributed to the phenomenal development of the California public junior colleges. For the catalogue period of 1943 to 1947, the 12 free-tuition institutions in California offered more than 200 semiprofessional course groups, or an average of 17 per college.

<sup>3</sup> Phebe Ward, *Terminal Education in the Junior College*, p. 17. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.

**PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES.**—The terminal function has predominated in the public junior college. The number of curriculums for the 43 public colleges increased from 33 to 408 and reached an average of more than nine per public junior college.

**PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES.**—In the final grouping in Table 1, the trends are summarized for the private junior colleges. Here the contrast with the public junior colleges is more striking than are the relative increases. During the period studied, semiprofessional offerings tripled in the private junior colleges, with a corresponding rise in the average offerings per college. The total number of offerings rose from 49 to 157, and the average per private junior college rose from 1.53 to 5.23.

Only in Schuytema's first tabulation did the offerings of the private junior colleges exceed those of the public junior colleges. In 1925, the 32 private junior colleges featured a combined listing of 49 terminal programs, outnumbering the 33 such programs found among the 43 public junior colleges.

In contrast, the latest data revealed that the public junior colleges are placing a far greater stress on terminal education, offering 408 semiprofessional course units to 157 offered by the private junior colleges.

Although a variety of new curriculums typified the twenty-year

expansion, the leading offerings remained about the same. Among the twenty different groups reported by Schuytema, general business, teaching, music, and secretarial work were offered most frequently.<sup>4</sup> In Eells, emphasis on an additional curriculum, home economics, was

community of youth. The public junior colleges, however, vary significantly in the number of semiprofessional offerings made available. Several factors may explain this range in emphasis, but perhaps the most important of these is tuition.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF SEMIPROFESSIONAL CURRICULUMS OFFERED IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN FOUR PERIODS

Type of College and Investigation	Number of Colleges	Semiprofessional Curriculums Offered	
		Total	Average
Public and private junior colleges:			
Schuytema (1925) .....	75	82	1.09
Schuytema (1935) .....	75	157	2.09
Eells (1938-39) .....	67*	419	6.25
Catalogue data (1943-47) .....	73†	565	7.74
Public junior colleges:			
Schuytema (1925) .....	43	33	0.77
Schuytema (1935) .....	43	91	2.12
Eells (1938-39) .....	43	301	7.00
Catalogue data (1943-47) .....	43	408	9.49
Private junior colleges:			
Schuytema (1925) .....	32	49	1.53
Schuytema (1935) .....	32	66	2.06
Eells (1938-39) .....	24	118	4.92
Catalogue data (1943-47) .....	30	157	5.23

\* Information for eight colleges was not available.

† Information for two colleges was not available.

reported.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the catalogues for 1943 to 1947, listing a total of forty-seven subject groups, followed the same frequency pattern, with the sole emergence to prominence of radio training.

In brief, the comparative data are indicative of the more effective response by the public junior colleges to the relative needs of the

### *Influence of Tuition*

To analyze this contention, the semiprofessional curriculums of the forty-three public junior colleges were examined with respect to whether the colleges charged tuition or were tuition-free. A pre-war school year (1939-40) was selected for this catalogue investigation. This choice eliminated the impetus of civilian war training and also the subsidized education

<sup>4</sup> Guy L. Schuytema, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

<sup>5</sup> Walter Crosby Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

of the war veteran. The grouping produced twenty tuition-free and twenty-three tuition-charging junior colleges, the charges ranging from \$16 to \$100 a year.

The main facts concerning the semiprofessional offerings in the two types of junior colleges are summarized in Table 2. Before turning to the tabulation, the reader will find it interesting to note the nature of the measures which comprised the ensuing compilation.

Tuition-free junior colleges offered from three to thirty-five semiprofessional curriculums. Eleven of the twenty in the group offered ten or more such curriculums. The tuition-free junior colleges of California led in all statistical aspects. The tuition-charging junior colleges had a much narrower range within the vocational field. From a high of sixteen offerings, the number dwindled to a lone available curriculum in one junior college, while only four junior colleges offered a variety of ten or more.

The comparison of the differences in offerings as affected by tuition revealed contrasts resembling that of the public and private junior college data reported in Table 1. Of the 336 semiprofessional curriculums found in the catalogues, an increase of 35 over the number reported by Eells for the previous year, 220, or approximately two-thirds of the total, were offered by

the tuition-free junior colleges, with a per college average of eleven. The pattern for situations with tuition-charging public junior colleges reflected statistically a close likeness of the curriculum trend among the private junior colleges described. In 1939-40 twenty-three tuition-

TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF SEMIPROFESSIONAL CURRICULUMS OFFERED BY 20 TUITION-FREE AND 23 TUITION-CHARGING PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

<i>Type of Public Junior College</i>	<i>Semiprofessional Curriculums Offered</i>	
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Average</i>
Tuition-free (1939-40) ...	220	11.00*
Tuition-charging (1939-40)	116	5.04

\* Eleven was also the median number of curriculums offered per tuition-free junior college. For the tuition-charging junior colleges, the median number was four.

charging public junior colleges presented 116 semiprofessional curriculums with a per college average of 5.04. In the previous year, according to Eells, 24 private junior colleges had listed 118 similar course groups, or 4.92 per institution.

In a follow-up study of high-school graduates entering college in 1941, Koos emphasized the important influence that proximity and a policy of free tuition exercise on democratization of the junior college.<sup>6</sup> In this sampling, also, it is apparent that a policy of free tuition is a contributive factor in the

<sup>6</sup> Leonard V. Koos, *Integrating High School and College: The Six-Four-Four Plan at Work*, pp. 123-28. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.

widening of the semiprofessional curricular horizon. Perhaps it may be better stated that, when tuition is not a barrier to matriculation, the augmented enrolment results in a student body of varied interests. To meet these diverse vocational desires, the tuition-free junior college has been expanding the scope of its curriculum.

### *Conclusions*

In this analysis of the semiprofessional curriculums in seventy-five public and private junior colleges, certain general trends are discernible during a twenty-year span.

1. Whatever the instrument of measurement, public junior colleges show greater gains in the terminal aspect of education.

2. There has been a rapid increase in the total number of cur-

riculums offered by junior colleges. The trend has been much more pronounced among the tuition-free public junior colleges than among the tuition-charging public junior colleges and the private junior colleges.

3. The western junior colleges, especially the tuition-free public junior colleges, far outrank the other junior colleges in the expansion of the semiprofessional curriculums.

4. In spite of the addition of new curriculums, teaching, general business, and secretarial work are still the dominant offerings. Two new curriculums, home economics and radio, have also become important.

5. The trend is marked by the impact of technology, which has produced new semiprofessional fields akin to the professional occupations.

# *Accreditation Procedures for California Junior Colleges*

## SUMMARY REPORT

THIS summary report of the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the California Committee for the Study of Education is based on an investigation made by Jules Fraden in partial satisfaction of requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of California. The recommendations of this report are put forth by Mr. Fraden, not by the subcommittee. The members of the subcommittee were:

Rev. James T. O'Dowd, superintendent of Catholic schools, San Francisco Diocese

Harrison M. Karr, associate director of relations with schools, University of California at Los Angeles

Marion McCart, district superintendent of schools, Yuba City, California

Basil H. Peterson, president of Orange Coast Junior College, Newport Beach, California—*chairman*

### *Accreditation in California*

In 1902, J. Stanley Brown established the first local public junior college at Joliet, Illinois. It was not long before a large number of high schools were admitting postgraduate students for additional study.

Subsequently there arose the question of recognition of junior-college and post-high-school training. Should universities grant advanced standing for such credit?

In 1917 the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools became the first regional association to accredit junior colleges. In time, other regional associations and agencies began to accredit junior colleges. As a result, the American Council on Education attempted to unify the standards of the different agencies by issuing a set of principles and standards for accrediting junior colleges.

In California the situation relative to junior-college accreditation is unique. Strictly speaking, there is no accrediting agency for California public junior colleges at the present writing (1947). The State Board of Education, operating through the State Department of Education, sets minimum standards for public junior colleges for the purpose of granting state financial aid. So far the state has not



actively functioned as an accrediting agent. The University of California has appraised the academic functioning of junior colleges and, for transfer purposes, has recognized academic credit earned in junior colleges, but the state university is not, in reality, an accrediting agent.

With the beginning of World War II, California junior colleges were excluded from participation in military training programs because their names did not appear on the approved list of some recognized accrediting agency. Since the war, the Navy, on the same basis, has refused to recognize training received in California public junior colleges as collegiate training.

California junior colleges are now confronted with another accreditation problem. Shall the junior colleges participate in the program of technical-institute accreditation sponsored by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development?

#### *The Problem and Sources of Evidence*

It was the purpose of this study to determine and to evaluate the present accreditation practices and procedures in junior colleges of the United States, with special reference to California.

Data were gathered from three sources: (1) junior-college accreditation rules, regulations, standards, and report forms of state depart-

ments of education, state universities, regional associations, and other accrediting agencies; (2) comprehensive study of the literature in the field of junior-college accreditation; (3) returns on inquiry forms sent to all junior-college administrators in the United States, 81 per cent of whom reported.

The data from these various sources were carefully analyzed to solve the problem under investigation. The junior-college administrators were used as a jury to evaluate accreditation procedures.

#### *Recommendations*

1. California junior colleges should be accredited by a regional accrediting agency by *one* of the following methods:

a) The constitution of the Western Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools should be changed so that California junior colleges may be accredited by this organization.

b) Individual California junior colleges should petition for membership in an accrediting agency, such as the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

c) California junior colleges should join the Northwest Association and thereby help to develop a strong western association.

2. Accrediting junior colleges by method (c), that is, by having them

join the Northwest Association and thereby help to develop a strong western association, is recommended as the best proposal.

3. The California state legislature should amend the *Education Code*, section 4861, to allow for a more generous expenditure of funds so that accreditation fees may be included. At present the *Code* reads:

The governing board of any school district and the governing board of any junior-college district may subscribe for membership for any school under its jurisdiction in any society, association, or organization which has for its exclusive purpose the promotion and advancement of public education through research and investigation and the publication of reports on education problems. The State Board of Education shall approve a list of societies, associations, and organizations in which membership may be taken. No payment shall be made out of school funds for membership in any society, association, or organization whose name does not appear in the list approved by the State Board of Education. The total amount paid on account of all such memberships shall not exceed fifty dollars (\$50) for any school year.

4. The California State Board of Education should include the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools on its approved list of organizations.

5. The University of California should continue its evaluation of the academic functioning of the

California junior colleges, and this evaluation should form one of the bases of the accrediting procedure.

6. The work of the Junior College-University of California Conference Committee, which was formed in 1932, should be continued.

7. The work of the Master Committee on Relations of Schools for the State of California, which was formed in 1944, should be continued.

8. The California State Department of Education should adopt, with certain revisions, the junior-college standards proposed by the California Junior College Federation and thereby take a more active part in the accreditation of the California public junior colleges.

9. In the light of prevalent practices throughout the United States, the following California proposed standards should be reviewed and revised:

a) The maximum faculty teaching load shall be eighteen units based upon a formula: one lecture hour equals one unit teaching load, two laboratory hours equal one unit teaching load.

The maximum faculty teaching load should read "sixteen" instead of "eighteen" units, and the following statement should be added:

Consideration shall be given for duties other than teaching in determining the teaching load.

b) The ratio of teaching faculty to

students shall not be less than one to thirty, according to the full-time student enrolment as determined by the October report to the State Department of Education.

The ratio of teaching faculty to students should be changed to "one to twenty-five."

c) Maintain courses and training in such vocational-terminal fields as may be required to meet the needs of the local region; and in such academic fields as the following: the natural sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and physical education.

It is recommended that the field of mathematics be added to the list in paragraph c.

d) Expend annually for library books, periodicals, and bindings at least \$2.50 per student.

This standard should be revised to read:

Expend annually for library books, periodicals, and bindings at least \$3.00 per student.

10. The California State Department of Education, the regional association, and the University of California should co-ordinate their activities with respect to the accrediting of the California junior colleges in order to eliminate any conflicts or working at cross-purposes.

## *The Pension Problem in Junior Colleges*

R. McALLISTER LLOYD

TEN years of social security and the current social concept regarding retirement and insurance benefits for employees in manufacturing and commercial enterprises and in government service have focused attention on the institutions that have no such security plans or whose plans are inadequate. This article will outline some of the problems with respect to retirement and insurance plans and describe briefly the services available to junior colleges through Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

TIAA was organized in 1918 on the initiative of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and was endowed by the Carnegie Corporation to help certain types of educational organizations provide some measure of economic security for staff members and their dependents. After consultation with leading executives of educational institutions and with experienced businessmen, TIAA

was incorporated under New York State law by special charter as a nonprofit legal-reserve life-insurance company. TIAA's charter provides that the association's purpose is "to aid and strengthen nonproprietary and nonprofit-making colleges, universities and other institutions engaged primarily in education or research by providing annuities and life insurance suited to the needs of such institutions and of the teachers and other persons employed by them on terms as advantageous to the holders and beneficiaries of such contracts and policies as shall be practicable and by counseling such institutions and their employees concerning pension plans or other measures of security."

In so far as we know, no comprehensive study of retirement and insurance plans covering both public and private junior colleges has been made. A great many public junior colleges are automatically included in publicly administered retirement plans. Many private junior colleges likewise have retirement and insurance plans.

The Columbia University Press has recently published a book

---

R. McALLISTER LLOYD is president of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, New York City.

entitled *College Retirement and Insurance Plans* by William C. Greenough, which should prove interesting to administrators of junior colleges. It analyzes, with respect to colleges and universities, the various types of retirement plans that are likewise to be found in junior colleges. The book includes a table, adapted in Table 1,

Professors. Furthermore, junior colleges not included in this classification may apply for a special eligibility ruling.

All institutions, whether or not they have retirement and insurance plans in effect, should scrutinize this phase of their employee relations periodically. In the case of colleges which do not have a plan,

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF FACULTY RETIREMENT PROVISIONS IN UNITED STATES COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
(NOT INCLUDING JUNIOR COLLEGES OR STATE TEACHERS' COLLEGES)

Type of Retirement Plan	Institutions		Teachers	
	Number	Per Cent	(Approximate)	Per Cent
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association plans .....	281	33.4	46,243	45.7
Publicly administered plans .....	108	12.8	22,373	22.1
Plans for religious workers .....	47	5.6	2,391	2.4
Agency life-insurance company plans ..	45	5.4	8,025	7.9
Non-funded plans .....	21	2.5	3,059	3.0
Self-funded plans .....	6	.7	3,983	4.0
No plan .....	145	17.2	6,476	6.4
No information .....	189	22.4	8,547	8.5
	842	100.0	101,097	100.0
Deduct duplicates .....	19	.....	2,899	.....
	823	.....	98,198	.....

which summarizes retirement provisions as of December 31, 1946. It is notable that, although 40 per cent of the colleges and universities in the United States did not indicate having any retirement plan, these institutions employ only 15 per cent of the teachers.

The services of TIAA are automatically available to any junior college, the faculty of which is eligible for membership in the American Association of University

consideration of some arrangement seems most essential, especially at this time when almost all educational institutions are attempting to augment their teaching staffs to take care of their students. Those institutions which already have a plan should review it to see whether it provides adequate benefits and whether it meets the objectives for which it was created.

Although the need for a retirement plan is now generally ac-



cepted, a few words to clarify again the objectives of a satisfactory method are in order. Administrative officers of educational institutions, boards of trustees, and faculty committees repeatedly verify that well-designed plans for retirement and insurance benefits for staff members help them—

1. To effect an orderly retirement of superannuated employees.
2. To attract promising new talent.
3. To retain above-average staff members.
4. To part easily, before retirement, with those who are not measuring up to the college's standards.
5. To budget a liability which otherwise could not be ascertained until it had perhaps reached staggering proportions.

The primary purpose of a retirement plan is, of course, to assure the college that it may part with its older staff members in a socially acceptable manner. It should generally be augmented by some life-insurance coverage to assure the college of relief from embarrassment upon the untimely death of an employee. Furthermore, educators know that, to induce the exceptional students now in our universities to choose teaching as a profession, more rewarding economic benefits must be offered. In addition to the necessity of attracting professional staffs, administrators are faced with the problem of obtaining and holding service per-

sonnel in competition with occupations which are covered by social security and other forms of guaranteed benefits.

When a benefit plan is to be established, there are many alternatives which must be considered in order to make the plan suitable to a particular institution. It is surprising how conditions vary. Administrators, boards of trustees, and faculty committees wish to know, when coming to decisions, what other institutions have done. They need to be familiar with such provisions as the following:

1. What employees should the plan cover?
2. Should participation be required or optional for eligible employees?
3. How long a waiting period should be provided for participants?
4. What should be the retirement age and should any provision be made for extending it?
5. What contribution rates should be used and how shared between the college and the staff member?
6. Should survivor benefits be included?

Perhaps persons associated with junior colleges will be interested in some of the information supplied in Greenough's book which is mentioned above. Table 2 summarizes the provisions of 298 TIAA college and university plans.

It should be emphasized that this summary indicates what various colleges are doing. However, the

"majority vote," in our opinion, does not necessarily indicate a preference which should be followed. Many plans have been in existence for a long time and would not be set up on the same basis

thinking has been applied to this subject, and many improved methods are in use. Consequently each college should select provisions which most nearly fit its needs. One of the reasons why so many

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS IN 298 TIAA COLLEGE RETIREMENT PLANS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1946

<i>Provision</i>	<i>Number of Plans</i>	<i>Provision</i>	<i>Number of Plans</i>
Classes of employees covered:		Retirement age:	
Faculty only .....	40	65, extensions not mentioned ..	65
Faculty and administrative staff ..	172	66-70, extensions not mentioned	43
Substantially all employees ...	80	65, normal; extensions allowed	
Miscellaneous .....	6	(57 plans to age 70 only) ...	111
Total .....	298	66-70, normal; extensions allowed	30
Voluntary and compulsory participation:		Optional after 65; required at	
Voluntary for all eligibles .....	62	68 or 70 .....	22
Compulsory for all eligibles ...	(177)	Lower for women than for men .	10
Voluntary for present employees; compulsory for new .....	(42)	Miscellaneous .....	17
Compulsory for faculty and administrative staff; voluntary for others .....	(17)	Total .....	298
Total with compulsory element .....	236	Contribution rates:	
Total .....	298	Under 10 per cent (individual and institution) .....	17
Waiting period for faculty and administrative officers, compulsory plans only:		10 per cent (individual and institution) .....	224
None .....	52	12 per cent (individual and institution) .....	(5)
1-3 years .....	99	15 per cent (individual and institution) .....	(10)
Longer than 3 years .....	11	Other above 10 per cent matched	(29)
Age 30 (plus one of above) ...	34	Total above 10 per cent matched	44
Until on tenure .....	10	Miscellaneous .....	13
Miscellaneous .....	30	Total .....	298
	236		

if they were to be established now. For instance, it is now considered that 10 per cent of salary as contributions purchases too small a benefit and that contributions should be about 15 per cent of salary. In the past few years much

prominent educational institutions have established TIAA plans is the concept of academic mobility. To express this briefly: it seemed important to the educators who established TIAA that a teacher be able to migrate from one institu-

tion to another without losing retirement benefits. Most plans in industry and almost all plans for employees in publicly supported institutions inflict a severe forfeiture on the participant who transfers jobs before retirement. Usually if the employee leaves a state plan any time before retirement, his own contribution is returned to him with or without interest, but he loses the employer's contribution. This plan retards free interchange of professional staff members among institutions of higher learning. In contrast, teachers, research workers, and scientists may now

move about among the five hundred institutions of higher education and research that have TIAA plans, all the while building up their retirement income.

As indicated, one of the functions of TIAA is to give counsel concerning security plans to colleges, universities, and other institutions engaged primarily in education, and to their employees. Thus, regardless of whether an organization uses or contemplates using TIAA contracts, the association gladly offers its consultative services without charge to all junior colleges or to the employees of such institutions.

## General-Education Program of One Thousand Girls

KENNETH H. FREEMAN

IN RECENT years curriculum discontent has reached the college level. Much of this discontent has been expressed through condemnation of the lack of general-education programs in colleges. The varied reactions to *General Education in a Free Society*<sup>1</sup> are evidence of the intense interest in the problem of general education. It shows an awareness of the problem and considerable disagreement concerning methods of solution. A healthy state in education is evidenced by the great number of colleges which are publishing the results of their attempts to plan a program of general education for their own situations.<sup>2</sup>

It is highly probable that far too much of the work with general education has taken an "armchair philosophy" as a point of departure. Pioneer work has been done by Koos,<sup>3</sup> Colvert,<sup>4</sup> and Reynolds<sup>5</sup> in conducting research which revealed the lack of a general-education pro-

gram and the points of deficiency. This type of research is basic to sound curricular change. Two reasons for this type of research may be well illustrated by quotations, one from French and one from Willey:

First, there is the question of whether there is now the well-nigh complete absence of a common program of education at the high-school level which this committee reports.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *General Education in a Free Society*. Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Stephen M. Corey, "The Current College Controversy," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, XXXIII (March, 1947), 175-88.

<sup>3</sup> Leonard V. Koos, *Integrating High School and College: The Six-Four-Four Plan at Work*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.

<sup>4</sup> Clyde C. Colvert, *A Critical Analysis of the Public Junior College Curriculum*. Abstract of Contribution to Education No. 199. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937.

<sup>5</sup> James W. Reynolds, "The Adequacy of the General Education Program of Local Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1945.

<sup>6</sup> Will French, "The Harvard Report and the High School," *North Central Association Quarterly*, XXI (October, 1946), 177-82.

KENNETH H. FREEMAN, is dean of faculty at Christian College, Columbia, Missouri.

The primary task, then, of any college or university concerning itself with postwar planning is to undertake a self-appraisal.<sup>7</sup>

### *Present Study*

Two reasons for research describing the existing situation are (1) to provide proof for the remaining skeptics who think our students obtain a general education and (2) to provide individual schools with a point of departure for curricular revision.

This article is based on a study which purposed to describe the general-education program experienced by one thousand young women attending a private junior college during the years 1940-45, inclusive. The study had the following limitations: (1) the necessity of forming an arbitrary definition of authoritative origin for general education; (2) the quantitative nature of the study, involving transcript and permanent-record course titles and credits; (3) the fact that the study does not involve men; (4) the unusual conditions of the period covered by the study owing to the war; and (5) the use of only one private junior college.

### *General-Education Program*

A satisfactory general-education program was described for the

<sup>7</sup> Malcolm M. Willey, "Basic Issues for Higher Education in the Postwar Period," *North Central Association Quarterly*, XIX (October, 1944), 171-76.

study. The description was based on the "common learnings" program proposed by the Educational Policies Commission in its publication, *Education for All American Youth*.<sup>8</sup> It is advocated that the student spend one-third of his time in high school and one-sixth of his time in junior college (community institute) on the "common learnings" program. The purpose of the program is to develop:

- I. Civic responsibility and competence.
- II. Understanding of the operation of the economic system and of the human relations involved therein.
- III. Family relationships.
- IV. Intelligent action as consumers.
- V. Appreciation of beauty.
- VI. Proficiency in the use of language.

For the analysis here reported, it is assumed that subjects or courses as now taught in high schools and colleges generally contribute to development in the six areas listed.

The "general-education program" may, then, be described as the subject-matter units comprising the one-third (of the average number of graduation units) taken by the greatest number of high-school students and the semester hours comprising the one-sixth (of

<sup>8</sup> *Education for All American Youth*, pp. 248-50. Washington: Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, 1944.



the average number of graduation hours) taken by the greatest number of junior-college students. The qualification introduced by the phrase, "the greatest number of students," is based on the contention that this program should consist of learning experiences that everyone needs.

### *High-School Program*

A survey of the permanent records of the students revealed at least fifty-two different high-school courses. The number of students taking each course and the average number of units completed were determined. The courses taken with the greatest frequency were selected in descending order until the total of the average units completed in the respective courses equaled the average number of units completed for graduation.

The resultant typical high-school program for these one thousand girls is presented in Table 1. One may note that the average number of graduation units is 16.7. One-third of this amount (5.5 units) represents the number of units in the general-education program. English, which is the subject taken by the greatest number of students, comprises 3.8 units of the 5.5 units allotted for general education. History is the subject taken by the next greatest number of students. It is obvious that the average number of units completed in history

(2.0) and English (3.8) exceed the amount allotted for general education by 0.3 of a unit. A strict application of the quantitative definition stated previously produces a general-education program in high school which is composed of 3.8 units in English and 1.7 units in history (after deduction of the excess 0.3 of a unit).

TABLE 1.—TYPICAL HIGH-SCHOOL PROGRAM  
TAKEN BY 1,000 JUNIOR-COLLEGE GIRLS

<i>Course</i>	<i>Percentage of Students Taking Course</i>	<i>Average Number of Units Completed</i>
English .....	100.0	3.8
History .....	98.5	2.0
Algebra .....	94.2	1.4
Plane geometry ..	85.1	1.0
Commercial sub- jects .....	79.2	1.7
Latin .....	66.1	2.0
General biology ..	59.0	1.0
Civics .....	52.7	0.9
Domestic science ..	52.2	1.4
Music .....	50.9	1.5
All subjects ..	.....	16.7

The one thousand girls in this study represent approximately forty states and many high schools. It is interesting to note in this sampling the lack of evidence of basic curricular change in the typical high-school program.

### *Junior-College Program*

The analysis and treatment just described in the discussion of the high-school program was applied to the records of the students' junior-college work. This revealed 131 different courses and the typical

program of courses presented in Table 2.

The average number of semester hours completed was 50.2. One-sixth of this amount (8.3 semester hours) represents the number of semester hours allotted to the gen-

TABLE 2.—TYPICAL JUNIOR-COLLEGE PROGRAM TAKEN BY 1,000 JUNIOR-COLLEGE GIRLS

Course	Percentage of Students Taking Course	Average Number of Semester Hours Completed
English composition .....	98.4	5.9
General psychology .....	53.1	2.8
Voice and diction .....	47.9	2.3
European history .....	45.3	5.1
English literature .....	34.5	5.3
Botany .....	34.0	5.2
Introduction to art .....	33.1	3.6
Inorganic chemistry .....	28.6	5.3
Elementary Spanish .....	27.3	4.8
American government .....	26.9	4.8
Intermediate Spanish .....	25.9	5.1
All courses ...	.....	50.2

eral-education program. The total of the average number of semester hours completed in each of the two subjects taken by the greatest number of students exceeds this amount by 0.4 of a semester hour. These subjects are English composition and general psychology. The general-education program in the junior college consists of 5.8 semester hours of English composition and 2.5 semester hours of general

psychology (less the 0.4 of a semester hour excess).

### *Summary for Both Levels*

A summary of the general-education program for these one thousand girls during the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth years of their school experience is presented in Table 3. No attempt is made to equate the units and semester hours used in high school and junior college, respectively.

TABLE 3.—GENERAL-EDUCATION PROGRAM FOLLOWED BY 1,000 GIRLS IN GRADES XI-XIV

Courses	Credit
English .....	3.8 units
History .....	1.7 units
English composition ...	5.8 semester hours
General psychology ....	2.5 semester hours

This summary is introduced to emphasize that in the entire four-year period only three separate fields of study reached all, or nearly all, the students. One of these three fields, psychology, reached only 53.1 per cent of the students. The prominence of instruction in English at both levels indicates similar subject-matter emphasis. The four courses listed in Table 3 represent only 2.2 per cent of the 183 different courses offered in the four-year period. In both high school and junior college the narrow scope of work in the two courses comprising the general-education program consumed more credit than allowed by the defini-

TABLE 4.—SELECTED COURSES WHICH MAY BE PRESUMED TO HAVE CONTRIBUTED SOME ELEMENTS OF GENERAL EDUCATION TO AREAS INDICATED

<i>High-School Course</i>	<i>Percentage Taking Course</i>	<i>Average Units Completed</i>	<i>Junior-College Course</i>	<i>Percentage Taking Course</i>	<i>Average Semester Hours Completed</i>
<i>Area I. Civic Responsibility and Competence</i>					
History .....	98.5	2.0	American government	26.9	4.8
Civics .....	52.7	.9	General sociology ...	22.7	3.0
Sociology .....	21.8	.6	American history ...	15.3	5.0
American government	9.7	.7	Contemporary Euro-		
Citizenship .....	9.2	.8	pean history .....	9.5	2.1
American problems ..	7.3	.6	International relations	4.1	2.1
World relations .....	2.3	.6			
Social science .....	0.9	1.5			
<i>Area II. Understanding of the Operation of the Economic System and of the Human Relations Involved Therein</i>					
Economics .....	23.6	0.5	General economics ...	15.9	5.1
Occupations .....	6.2	.7			
Personnel .....	1.3	.8			
Salesmanship .....	0.1	0.5			
<i>Area III. Family Relationships</i>					
Sociology .....	21.8	0.6	General sociology ...	22.7	3.0
Social living .....	5.6	.9	Social pathology ...	15.6	3.1
Life-problems .....	0.7	0.8	Marriage and the fam-		
			ily .....	15.1	2.8
<i>Area IV. Intelligent Action as Consumers</i>					
Domestic science ....	52.2	1.4	Textiles and clothing		
Economics .....	23.6	.5	selection .....	17.4	7.1
Salesmanship .....	0.1	0.5	Economics .....	15.9	5.1
			Food selection and		
			preparation .....	11.8	4.0
			Clothing construction	11.0	3.2
			Interior house design .	10.0	2.0
			Household problems .	9.2	2.0
			Foods and health ...	7.1	3.0
			House planning .....	5.9	2.0
			Food problems .....	0.5	2.6
<i>Area V. Appreciation of Beauty</i>					
Music .....	50.9	1.5	Introduction to art ..	33.1	3.6
Art .....	19.9	1.8	Masterpieces of litera-		
			ture .....	32.0	3.0
			Music appreciation ..	13.2	2.8
			Appreciation of art ..	10.6	2.0
<i>Area VI. Proficiency in the Use of Language</i>					
English .....	100.0	3.8	English composition .	98.4	5.9
Speech .....	36.1	1.7	Voice and diction ...	47.9	2.3
			Public speaking .....	18.8	2.7
			Beginning interpreta-		
			tion .....	8.6	2.2
			Creative writing ....	4.0	5.0

tion for general education. In brief, it appears that too great a proportion of the work was confined to the study of three courses. These observations seem to support the frequent charge of overspecialization in the curriculum.

One of the initial assumptions of this analysis was that courses as now taught in high schools and colleges generally contribute to the development in the areas proposed by the Educational Policies Commission in the presentation of their "common learnings" program. An interesting picture may be attained by arranging the courses under the major areas to which they may be presumed to contribute elements of general education. The percentage of students pursuing the different courses and the average amount

of credit received are indicated in Table 4.

### *Conclusions*

The evidence presented seems to warrant the following conclusions: (1) The diversity of the high-school and the junior-college programs, demonstrated by the great number of course offerings, does not promote or facilitate a program of general education. (2) The general-education programs at both the high-school and the junior-college levels are inadequate. (3) Neither the high-school nor the junior-college program compensates sufficiently for the inadequacies of the other. (4) The junior-college general-education program is even less adequate than that of the high school.

## *Administering the Student-Activity Program*

C. C. COLVERT

THE student-activity program in a junior college should not be considered "*extra-curriculum*" but rather should be looked on as a regular part of the curriculum of the college. The program of student activities may not be so important as the subject-matter offerings of the college, but it is almost as valuable. A well-planned and well-rounded program of student activities is essential to an adequate college experience.

This program should be related to the interests of the junior-college youth and should also have some connection with the curriculums of the college. If, for instance, some of the students are much interested in photography, then an amateur photographer's club should probably be organized, even though photography is not taught in the college as a part of the regular college program. If, however, photography is a subject of instruction, the club and the course can be related to each other; that is, the club can help maintain interest in

the credit course in photography, and, likewise, the course can be a source of training which makes for better and more interested members of the amateur photographer's club. Similarly, a dramatics club may be organized to take care of a student interest in dramatics, and, should speech or dramatics or both be taught in the college, the club can be an auxiliary agency to the course.

A word of caution should be given here. It is a bad policy to require membership in any particular club. It is also very unwise to demand that a student join a particular club merely because he is enrolled in an allied course. One should not be a requirement of the other. For instance, a student enrolled in a pre-professional or terminal curriculum in home economics must not be required to belong to the home-economics club, and, to be a member of the home-economics club should not mean that the student must be taking the course in home economics. Membership in the various activities should be voluntary, and it must be so if the students' deep and abid-

---

C. C. COLVERT is professor and consultant in junior-college education at the University of Texas.



ing interest in clubs is not to be dissipated. It is necessary, therefore, that the student-activity program be organized to provide for the varied interests of the entire student body. Since the curriculums of the college are developed according to the needs and interests of the student body, the student-activity program is also closely related to the subject offerings of the college.

The junior-college administrator should set up a faculty committee on student activities. Often it is advisable to have on this committee equal numbers of students and faculty members. If the committee functions as it should and performs the duties which ordinarily fall to it, the chairman of the committee should be assigned a lighter load of teaching, possibly three semester hours less than the normal load. If the junior college has a director of student personnel, who is assigned to the task of developing student activities along with other student relationships, this person should be chairman of the student-activity committee. There should always be such a committee even though there is a director of student personnel because the director needs the advice of the faculty and the students, which can be obtained through such a committee. The faculty has a definite responsibility for the student-activity program, and it can best meet this

responsibility through the medium of a good committee.

The student-activity committee has several important duties. For instance, the committee should have a program for promoting the clubs needed by the students. Students should be encouraged to be members of those clubs in which they are interested and for which they feel a need. The chairman or some other member of the committee should check the official student roster of each club against the total student enrolment and thus discover those students who belong to no club at all. It may be that such students have not found a club which appeals to them, or that they are timid about trying to secure membership in one or more clubs, or that they are not interested at all. Knowledge of these things will enable the committee to deal with the students and the program intelligently. The guidance and counseling division of the junior college can be of service in directing students into appropriate activities if the information secured by the student-activity committee is furnished it.

The committee should adopt some form of control to keep the student offices from being concentrated in the hands of a few students. It is natural for a student body to elect to office in several organizations a student who has outstanding talent in the particular

activities, and thus the student may have more offices than he can effectively fill. Some plan for limiting the number of student offices that one student may hold passes the places of leadership around and gives more students with leadership qualities opportunities for development.

The point plan suggested in Table 1 may be revised to suit local

Another important duty of the student-activity committee is to receive and pass on students' applications for new clubs. No new student club should be permitted until the proposed club or activity has presented a request to the student-activity committee and it has been approved by this committee. A proposed constitution of the club should accompany the application.

TABLE 1.—POINT SYSTEM FOR OFFICES HELD IN STUDENT ACTIVITIES  
(NINE IS MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS FOR ONE STUDENT)

<i>Office</i>	<i>Number of Points</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Number of Points</i>
Editor of college annual .....	5	President of a club .....	4
Editor of college paper .....	5	Secretary-treasurer of an organization .....	3
President of Freshman class ..	5	Vice-president of an organization ..	3
President of Sophomore class ..	5	Member of student council ....	2
President of student council ..	5	Other club or class officers ....	2
Business manager of college annual .....	4	Reporter on paper .....	2
Business manager of college paper .....	4		

conditions. As no student may acquire more than nine points for the student positions listed, no student can be president of the student council and also of the Sophomore class, since each of these offices carries five points. The editor of the college paper cannot also be editor of the college annual, since these two offices total ten points. A student may, however, be the president of the Freshman class (five points) and also be president of one of the student clubs (four points), since the two offices total only nine points, the maximum number allowed.

There are three other principles which are basic to a well-administered student-activity program.

First, the administration and faculty, through its student-activity committee, should require that each student club or activity have a faculty sponsor. The club should be privileged to elect the faculty sponsor of their choice. The duty of the sponsor is not to run the club or to dictate the policy; it is rather to be a helpful adviser and to fight the battles of the club before the student-activity committee and before the faculty and college administration whenever championship is

necessary. A faculty sponsor can be a great help in carrying over, year after year, experience which will be most valuable to the club.

Second, the finances of all student organizations should be handled through the business office of the college. This does not mean that the auditor or the business manager is to tell the clubs how to spend their money, but that the college administration and faculty, through the student-activity committee, needs a safe control over the financial obligations of the different clubs. If not legally, morally at least, the college is responsible for the debts and finances of its student organizations. The business office should keep the accounts of expenditures and income of each club. The treasurer of the club should deposit dues and other moneys of the club in the business office and take a receipt for the deposit. In case of expenditures, the treasurer or the secretary presents a bill approved for payment by the president and the faculty sponsor of the club. It is the duty of the business office to keep the clubs notified of their financial condition at any time requested. Such a system of financial accounting gives proper safeguards for both the students and the college in their responsibility to the clubs.

Third, a definite time should be set aside for the meetings of all the clubs of the junior college. In junior

colleges most of whose students live in the dormitories or in their own homes in the town, meetings may well be held after class hours and at night. In area junior colleges, such as county or multiple-county units, many of the students commute to and from the college each day, either in their own cars or in college busses, and these students have to leave for home as soon as the last class period for the day is over. In order to give all the stu-

TABLE 2.—SUGGESTED DAILY CLASS SCHEDULE

<i>Period</i>	<i>Time</i>
First bell .....	8: 20
1 .....	8: 25- 9: 15
2 .....	9: 20-10: 10
Activity .....	10: 15-10: 55
3 .....	11: 00-11: 50
4 .....	11: 55-12: 45
Lunch .....	12: 50- 1: 30
5 .....	1: 35- 2: 25
6 .....	2: 30- 3: 20
7 .....	3: 25- 4: 15

dents in these junior colleges an opportunity to participate in student activities, time for the meetings must be arranged during the regular class program. If college busses operate, it is difficult to get the students to the college until 8: 15 A.M., and classes must be over by 3: 30 or 4: 00 P.M. in order for the students to arrive home at a fairly reasonable hour.

A forty-minute club meeting seems to be adequate for most clubs. In Table 2 is presented a suggested daily class schedule which provides for an activity

period from 10: 15 to 10: 55 each morning. The schedule provides for six periods a day, beginning at 8: 20 in the morning and ending at 3: 20 in the afternoon. Should a seventh period be desired, the day will have to end at 4: 15.

It will be noted that a period of only forty minutes is allowed for lunch, but usually the college must

uling of double laboratory periods for the first and the second periods and the third and the fourth periods. For the same reason the lunch period is placed between the fourth and the fifth periods.

After the time in the class schedule has been set, the activities committee must work out, with the various student organizations, how

TABLE 3.—MONTHLY SCHEDULE OF STUDENT-ACTIVITY PERIOD

<i>Week</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>Thursday</i>	<i>Friday</i>
First	Assembly	College-paper staff College-annual staff	French club	Freshman class Sophomore class	Photography club Music club
Second	Assembly	College-paper staff History club	Speech club	Student council	Radio club Art club
Third	Assembly	College-paper staff College-annual staff	French club Home Eco-nomics club	Pre-law club Pre-med club Agriculture club Engineers' club	Gold Jackets Purple Jackets
Fourth	Assembly	College-paper staff History club	Phi Theta Kappa	Commerce club	Chemistry club

have a cafeteria and only those students who do not have a vacant period before or after the regular lunch period will eat during this forty-minute lunch period. Such a schedule means that the cafeteria must be open from 11: 50 A.M. to 2: 15 P.M.

It will also be noted that the class schedule places the activity period between the second and the third periods. This arrangement is made in order to permit the sched-

often each one will meet and on which days. Some organizations will meet once a week; others, twice a month; and others, only once a month. The student organization schedule given in Table 3 shows a college-assembly meeting on each Monday. The college-newspaper staff is scheduled to meet each Tuesday during the activity period. The staff of the college annual meets twice a month, on the first and the third Tuesdays. Most of

the other clubs meet only once a month.

The student-activities committee must make the final decision on placing a club meeting on the activity-program schedule. Some discretion must be used in deciding how often a club is to meet. Whether there is room on the schedule for two or more meetings a month and whether the club actually has a program demanding frequent meetings are two of the

factors influencing frequency of meetings.

The committee will have to be cautious about permitting clubs and organizations to have called meetings outside the regular meeting time, for called meetings will interfere with the students' attendance at the regularly scheduled club meetings. Meetings for the fifth week in a month, when one occurs, may be scheduled as the committee desires.



## *A New Approach to Survey Courses*

DONALD R. WATSON

As the general-education movement has spread among our colleges, there has been a marked trend toward the introduction of courses of the survey type. Usually such courses cut across the old, traditional subject-matter boundaries and attempt an integration of a broad field of knowledge. Textbooks for such courses in physical science, biological science, and social science are now plentiful and are available from several of the larger publishing houses. Current educational literature frequently assumes that this trend toward survey courses, so marked within the past ten years, is a sign of wholesome revision of college curriculums. On closer scrutiny, one is prompted to ask: Does the multiplicity of such offerings indicate a trend toward a satisfactory program of general education?

The answer to the inquiry depends on definition. If the primary objective of general education is to give the student, through casual exposure to vast assemblages of facts,

a kaleidoscopic view of man's accumulation of knowledge, then such surveys would seem a logical approach. Examination of many of the textbooks designed for survey courses reveals this "hay-baling" approach to general education. Ideally, we should like our students to be familiar with all aspects of knowledge. Actually, we can only approach this goal. If nearly a century ago Herbert Spencer was forced to ask, "What knowledge is of the most worth?" certainly today we have no choice other than to exercise selectivity in the development of any curriculum.

Investigations in the junior colleges of Chicago<sup>1</sup> and studies by Ralph Tyler<sup>2</sup> show conclusively that detailed factual material is soon forgotten and that recall is best for the broad generalizations of knowledge. Furthermore, transfer of training from one type of situation to another occurs through application of these general principles. Thus we have a clue for the selection of content in the broad-field

DONALD R. WATSON is dean of general education at San Diego State College, California.

<sup>1</sup> Unpublished studies.

<sup>2</sup> Ralph W. Tyler, "Permanence of Learning," *Journal of Higher Education*, IV (April, 1933), 203-4.

courses. If a limited number of fundamental principles can be selected as the skeleton of a course, facts may be chosen as needed to fill out the body. A course developed on such a basis is not a survey but a limited sampling of a field of knowledge. The materials which are so presented may be covered more thoroughly and result in the development of real insight into the basic principles involved.

Do such modified surveys constitute a valid general-education program? Again the problem is one of definition. If the primary objective of the general-education program is an introduction to the fields of knowledge, courses emphasizing selected general principles are a valid approach. However, there is increasing emphasis on a general-education program to meet more nearly the basic needs of students and of society. Does curriculum planning start with the student and his environment or with the fields of knowledge? If the former is the more valid approach, then the typical survey is putting the cart before the horse.

A program of general education premised on the needs approach involves analyses of the student group, of the community, and of the resources of the college. The data thus obtained concerning the students and their environment should enable the college to establish broad, general objectives. After

these have been accepted by the faculty as the basis for the program, each objective should be broken down into a series of specific outcomes in terms of student knowledges, skills, and attitudes. Now is the time to draw on subject matter, with all the resources of the college brought to bear on its assemblage; to make thorough use of subject matter, taught in a scholarly manner but not as an end in itself, taught to achieve certain predetermined outcomes in student behavior.

The resulting courses may be fairly comprehensive in a field or exceedingly fragmentary. Breadth of coverage is incidental if evaluation is made in terms of the changes in student behavior. Among objectives which are accepted by some colleges are increased ability to think critically, understanding of the scientific method, appreciation of the historical development of natural science and its relation to present problems, and the development of more interest in the responsibilities of citizenship. The complete conversion of the general-education program at Colgate University to the problem approach and President Conant's course at Harvard on experimental backgrounds of physical science are current examples of a shift from the encyclopedic approach in general education.

With a decrease in emphasis on

subject matter comes greater flexibility in methods of instruction. Lectures need not be the sole or even the primary approach. When problem-solving and training in critical thinking are stressed, instruction must be more individualized. For the best results, class sections should be small, with enrollments of from twenty to twenty-five. However, if small classes are not feasible for all meetings, there are advantages in a plan in which large groups meet once or twice a week and smaller sections meet between the large meetings. The large-group sessions may be used for demonstrations, for the showing of films and other visual aids, for lectures, and for examinations.

If smaller sections are possible, even for a part of the class sessions, the instructor has better opportunity to know the student and to sample his reactions. This knowledge should lead to some individualization of instruction in accordance with special interests and needs. Individualized work of this kind should parallel the activity of

the group program. It is most important that the small section provide occasion for group and individual consideration of problems related to course content. Through consideration of problems, the principles of the course are made functional for the students.

Are survey courses satisfactory for a program of general education? The answer depends on the objectives of the program. In summary, increasing dissatisfaction is developing with the concept of subject matter as an end in itself. As this trend progresses, survey courses of the older type, with voluminous subject matter, will be discarded as inadequate approaches to general education. In their place will be substituted general courses of selective content slanted to meet predetermined needs of students. Such content would be intimately related to the method of instruction, since objectives would be achieved through an integration of content and methodology.

## *The Junior College Library Is Better!*

EDITH M. GORMAN

THE modern ideal of a college library as the "heart" of the institution finds its truest expression in the junior-college library. Given proper implementation and a long-range program, the junior-college library more nearly approaches that ideal than is possible in the senior-college program.

Too often the senior-college library disregards the needs of the undergraduate, although the number of graduate students served is a relatively small part of the total enrolment. Too often, also, senior-college instructors "settle in" and come to think of lower classmen as necessary evils to be endured, lectured at, and passed through (or *not* passed through, in many cases) as quickly and as painlessly (to the faculty) as possible. Freshmen and Sophomores are not individuals but names in a book in which the instructor keeps his marks. Thus we have graduate students who begin their work for advanced degrees knowing little or nothing of the resources or the treasures of the library. In some

cases, as will be noted later, this situation is the fault of the library staff. In others, it is the fault of the faculty members, who ignore the need for inculcation, in undergraduate students, of habits of reading and of research and of a knowledge of library materials.

The library "falls down" in hedging about its circulation desk with rigid rules and regulations that discourage all but the most hardy of Freshmen. The circulation desk is the main source of the library's contact with the average student in his beginning years in college. It is doubly unfortunate, then, that the circulation staff, in so many instances, is composed of the least-trained group of library workers—library assistants, with little or no formal training and with less judgment with regard to the enforcing or the relaxing of rules, and students who work a few hours a week and have no knowledge of the library's policies.

Does this state of affairs exist in the good junior college? It is much less likely to be found there because, in the main, the junior-college library is more closely super-

---

EDITH M. GORMAN is librarian at the Joplin Junior College, Missouri.

vised, has closer integration with the curriculum, and provides more individualized attention for the students. The instruction in a junior college takes more cognizance of the needs and individual differences of students than is possible in the senior institution. The librarian is, of necessity as well as choice, in constant contact with both faculty members and students. It is possible to have a more flexible code of regulations and to make the collection of materials serve all groups more adequately and more efficiently. It is not well for any library—or any institution—however large and important, to let routine become the master. Routine and rules are formulated to serve, and, whenever a slavish subservience to routine interferes with the use of books and other materials, a library is a sham and a delusion, as well as an unnecessary part of the educational system.

The junior-college library can be made into an instrument for community service and can vitalize the place of the junior college in civic life. With no hindrance to student use, citizens may come to the junior-college library as a research center and as a workshop in which trained assistance may be avail-

able for the making of club programs and in which materials not usually found in public libraries may be consulted, interlibrary loans arranged, and all the multi-colored phases of library service be made practical and functional. Book reviews, lectures on international affairs and current events by faculty members, appreciation courses, art exhibits, and the like, under the sponsorship of the college library, can aid in making the public conscious of the integral part played by the junior college in the community pattern of living.

This program, however, is not for the dyed-in-the-wool librarian who believes that "too free" circulation, by which he means *any* circulation, will bring dire results. This is a program for those librarians who can read O'Shaughnessy's lines:

One man with a dream, at pleasure,  
Shall go forth and conquer a crown;<sup>1</sup>

and see their application to a vital, living program that will make the junior-college library into a real workshop and laboratory—the "heart" of the junior college and an instrument for community service.

<sup>1</sup>"Ode," *Poems of Arthur O'Shaughnessy*. Edited by William Alexander Percy. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1923.



## *From the Executive Secretary's Desk*

JESSE P. BOGUE

THE Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, published in December, 1947, under the series title, "Higher Education for American Democracy," made the front page in practically every daily across the country. The first volume, *Establishing the Goals*, played up the role of the community college for the extension of education of college grade. It gave due consideration to the part being taken by private institutions in both the junior-college and the senior-college fields of education. The public was somewhat startled, judging by editorial comment, by what appears to be a revolutionary suggestion, namely, that two additional years of free public education be now added to the twelve years already provided.

The entire Report of the President's Commission will be published in six volumes. It is understood that more space will be allotted to the junior college than to any other single phase of education. For many years junior colleges have advocated the recommendations now being made by the Commission. Perhaps nothing has taken place since the founding of junior colleges a half-century ago that has so

deeply stimulated public interest in these institutions. Junior colleges were ably represented on the President's Commission by Dr. H. A. Dixon, president of Weber College, Ogden, Utah. The public-relations values of the report are immeasurable for junior colleges. We predict that many faltering state legislatures will come to life on junior colleges for their states. Private colleges, pressed for further funds to strengthen their programs, will find many road-blocks removed in their campaigns for public support.

### *General Editorial Comment*

The writer has been interested in reading general editorial comment on the junior colleges during the past year. From every section of the nation this comment has reflected favorably on these institutions and on their work. Perhaps a few excerpts from various parts of the country may illustrate the general trends of editorial opinion. The *Virginian-Pilot* of Norfolk, Virginia, on October 14, 1947, published a fourteen-inch editorial entitled "University of Wisconsin on Junior Colleges." The editorial writer had evidently read *Junior College Needs in Wisconsin* by John

Guy Fowlkes and Henry C. Ahrnsbrak. The editorial was written on the occasion of the inauguration of President Darden at the University of Virginia and as a fuller treatment of one paragraph in his inaugural address. Darden said:

It is my belief that the number leaving high school who desire some college work is within a few years going to exceed the capacity of the state institutions. Consequently I believe we should give careful consideration to the establishment of colleges giving two years of sound work to both men and women. This has been done with great success by the College of William and Mary in both Norfolk and Richmond. The experiment has enabled many to secure the training they desire at a cost within their means, and it has relieved to a degree the congestion in the parent-institution.

The *Virginian-Pilot* editorial commented in part as follows:

Wisconsin is a larger and wealthier state than Virginia, and has many more privately operated two-year colleges,<sup>1</sup> but the two states have many basic characteristics in common—including their predominantly agricultural economy. There is no Wisconsin counterpart for Virginia's large Negro population, but this difference modifies in only a relative sense the institutional deficiencies which both labor under on the college training level. There are good reasons for believing that findings of the University of Wisconsin study are applicable with a high degree of pertinency to the situation in Virginia.

<sup>1</sup> NOTE: Wisconsin has five private two-year colleges; Virginia, thirteen.

It is interesting to observe that the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation went on record in November, 1947, to the effect that the Federation should "look forward and work towards the building of many of our high schools into junior colleges to make two-year college courses available to our boys and girls at their homes." The Federation represents twenty-one thousand members in the state of Virginia.

The Savannah (Georgia) *News* of December 2, 1947, published a seventeen-inch editorial, inspired by the Report of the President's Commission and out of the interest of the *News* in Armstrong Junior College located in Savannah:

It is reported from Washington this week that President Truman's Committee on Higher Education is expected to announce its recommendations at the end of this month, and that it is expected to place junior colleges at the center of its proposed reorganization of the American school system.

It is expected to urge that more junior colleges be established to care for all qualified students, and the committee is said to be in favor of calling junior colleges "community colleges" to emphasize their role.

If this report proves to be true, it will be of particular interest to Savannahians because of the fact that we have in our midst the Armstrong Junior College which by virtue of its excellent twelve-year record has become one of the most important junior colleges in the South and in the nation.

In view of the expected recommen-

dations of the Truman committee it would appear that what one educator has called "a revolution in U.S. education" is on its way, and that this revolution will center around the junior college. . . .

Many of our junior colleges—and Armstrong is conspicuous in this respect—have charted their courses to meet community requirements in large measure. This is done on a basis of the particular kinds of trained personnel needed in the business and industrial spheres of a given community, so that junior colleges that carry out such a program are helping the community in a vital way economically.

At the same time students are given training which they definitely can use when they are graduated.

A recent survey indicates that in many American towns, some of the best jobs go begging because they require certain special training which job-seekers lack—but that such a situation is rarely found where an alert junior college exists!

"College Folk Have Tough Going" is the title of a signed special editorial in the Columbus (Georgia) *Ledger-Inquirer* of September 28, 1947. The writer of the editorial, Maynard R. Ashworth, had visited the State University at Athens and wrote about his impressions of the crowded conditions, the kinds of houses in which many students were compelled to live, the expenses of board and room and transportation. After reviewing the general situation, Ashworth said:

My object in pointing all this out is to emphasize the dire need for a junior college right here in Columbus. We have heard much regarding this

junior college, the school board wants it, everyone seems to be in favor of it, but no concrete action has been taken to start it on its way. . . .

Some felt when the extension course, night school of the University of Georgia, was established here, need for the junior college would not exist. This is not the fact. If anything, this University of Georgia Freshman and Sophomore extension work only emphasizes the need for a junior college. Some three hundred applications are now in for classes in this extension work and this is all that can be handled. This should indicate there is a dire need for a junior college, and I am sure if we had a junior college—in fact, all over the state they should be in existence—attendance would be overflowing. This would take the strain off the University system in the Freshman and Sophomore years. This is important as close supervision is needed from all sides during these years and this is just not possible, to any satisfactory extent, in large schools at the present time.

What are we going to do about it? The problem is an easy one to solve. Columbus has the money—its people have, anyway—and I believe if certain individuals in this city are called on by the right people, right now, enough money can be got together to tie down the desired land and start this badly needed project.

We say we want more industries. Well, here is something worth much more than any one industry.

The returns to the cultural side of the city are incalculable; to the youth of our city they would be more than monetary value can cover. . . .

Right now Columbus is lopsided—all industry and very little on the intellectual or cultural side. Balancing is what we need, and a junior college

will do much to round out our community. . . .

The Booneville (Mississippi) *Independent*, for October 30, 1947, commented favorably on the rising junior college for the ninth zone, as the thirteenth institution in the state's planned system. The editorial not only strongly boosts the local junior college but also supports the movement as a whole:

Work on the junior-college buildings is moving along nicely. This should be an inspiration to all of us. This must be made one of the very best junior colleges in this state. It can be. Any person in this county who tries to obstruct, or in any way keep it from being the very best is not worthy of citizenship. If you cannot be for our junior college, then mercy upon you. It is the purpose of the junior-college board of directors to push the work as rapidly as possible so that the school may open next fall. Everywhere we go people are asking, "Can my boy, my girl, get into the junior college at Booneville this next fall?" We hope so. That applies to students from adjoining counties as well as in ours. We must meet this responsibility. Prentiss County must do its full duty, and when it does the adjoining counties will be with us.

It seems to be the consensus of opinion by education experts that the junior college is giving more education for less money than other educational institutions. They are proving that the boy or girl who wants an education does not have to go a long way from home to secure the fundamentals of education. Let every person put his shoulder to the wheel for our college, talk it, support it with our funds and

with our children. It is bringing to us a new day. Let us be as proud of it as a newborn child in the family.

During the months of October and November of last year many editorials were written in Michigan papers. We have selected one that is typical, from the Muskegon Heights *Record*, October 30, 1947, entitled "Junior Colleges Are Here To Stay":

The junior college as an institution of higher learning is here to stay. We are convinced of that fact, as we always had been since junior colleges were first inaugurated—but after making a quick week-end tour of three large college campuses in Michigan, we are more certain than ever that the junior college is a most necessary element of the modern educational program.

By no means should the junior college ever be allowed to degenerate into a sort of post-high-school course of two years' duration. Junior colleges in this state have earned excellent reputations since the early 1920's. In addition, they have saved parents and college students thousands of dollars; or we may say they have saved local communities that amount by keeping local dollars at home in the community two years longer than they would have remained if the student had been forced to attend school in some other locality. Clothiers, grocers, and all other businesses stand to gain by having local students at home. The students (and their parents) stand to gain by the fact they are living at home where the cost of board and room, if anything, are considerably smaller than at any university or college campus away from home.

Instruction at junior colleges in Michigan is topnotch, in fact, may even, in some respects, surpass the instruction offered by some huge universities who employ assistants in the place of experienced professors for Freshmen and Sophomores. One of the nation's leading college presidents recently declared that junior colleges should be encouraged by every community, if only because their existence makes it possible for universities to concentrate more successfully upon work in the upper two years and in graduate study courses. The congestion at the University of Michigan, Michigan State College, and at Michigan State Normal College at the present time—despite the fact that progressive building programs are fast being completed—is testimony to the truth of such statements.

Junior colleges have earned their spurs. They are worthy of your highest respect and admiration—and loyalty. The only things they lack are fraternities and a stadium, two things which are expensive adjuncts even for the wealthier institutions.

"The Picture Changes," so writes the editor in the Mandan (North Dakota) *Pioneer* of October 8, 1947. Again the conditions in senior institutions are intelligently reviewed across the country. Evidently the editor had gathered a great deal of information from many states. He brought his editorial to a sharp point in the following closing paragraphs:

More junior colleges and vocational schools offering intensive courses in chosen fields will turn out useful and happier future citizens.

Those who wish to follow the professions must, of course, go on to the advanced centers of learning, but they, too, should be able to obtain necessary preliminary training in accredited junior colleges nearer home.

Mandan is big enough to plan such future education for its rising generations.

From the Yakima (Washington) *Republic* of October 16, 1947, we clip the following as a part of a six-inch editorial entitled "Junior College Fits In":

There is talk of limiting the number of students entering certain fields. The big worry is over producing a swelling crop of frustrated intellectuals with nothing to do—a class which Hitler used to good advantage in his rise to power.

Among several preventive steps, including better vocational guidance to steer youngsters from crowded fields, could be more attention to facilities of junior colleges such as that in Yakima. There are interesting possibilities in the semiprofessions. The junior colleges are ideal for specializing in this phase of advanced education. Yakima's college, given the money for facilities, equipment, and staff, could be of substantial value to the educational system of the whole state.

"Junior Colleges Aid Many Students" is an eye-catching, bold-type, fourteen-inch editorial in the September 2, 1947, *Times Herald* of Vallejo, California:

It is an established fact that students attending junior colleges enjoy practically every educational advantage they would receive in a large university. They may lack association



with great numbers of students, lose some of the enthusiasm and spirit of college athletics and other functions, but when you get right down to education, they have greater advantages in many respects than students in larger fields find. There are more opportunities for individual association and consultation with instructors. There may be an absence of certain facilities in the smaller junior colleges, but enterprising boards of education are striving to fill these gaps.

It is fortunate indeed for thousands of young veterans who are anxious to resume college work that we have so many fine junior colleges available. The costs are lower than in the larger college towns, there are more helping agencies, and in most instances the students live at home. It should be remembered that education is an individual matter and the individual with a strong desire to improve his standing will suffer little because he lacks some of the advantages larger schools offer. At best it requires hours of study to advance through the semesters without regard for any advantages that may be available. . . .

*Kiplinger Magazine*, Washington, D.C., December, 1947, carried a feature article on "The Junior College" with the subheading, "By Combining Job Training with Education, It Fills a Vital Need." The importance of this article appealed to the Little Rock Junior College, Little Rock, Arkansas, to such an extent that five thousand reprints were ordered for distribution to the citizens of that city. The article is based, in part, on an interview with the Executive Secretary of the

American Association of Junior Colleges. The following paragraphs are used with the special permission of *Kiplinger Magazine*:

A revolution in U.S. education is on its way. It will center on the junior colleges, and its aim will be to make education more truly functional.

This should be good news to the many persons who suspected that the traditional colleges may not be keeping up with today's complicated world. . . .

Junior colleges . . . provide:

*An economical means of making higher education available to high-school graduates who are qualified for it.*

*A combination of the occupational training which our society needs with the minimum of general education essential for good citizenship.*

That is why junior colleges are a real revolutionary force and why some educators call them the most original and important contribution America has made to education. . . .

Somewhere between general literacy and the training of specialists, there is a gap in American education. As one educator put it, the great army of U.S. industry has plenty of foot soldiers and a trained high command, but lacks competent noncommissioned officers.

Junior colleges, which supply this intermediate need, are the result of an experiment in which not only educators took part. Businessmen in communities from California to New York have co-operated in organizing junior-college courses, and sometimes in teaching them. So have doctors, lawyers, engineers, and industrial scientists.

These men have brought encour-

aging reports. *Graduates of a well-run junior college, they say, have broader backgrounds than the average trade-school or technical-institute student. And they possess more useful skills and practical knowledge than many university B.A.'s. . . .*

Organizationally, junior colleges have serious handicaps. For lack of funds they often have to use high-school plants, thus limiting themselves to night classes, and high-school teachers, not all of whom are equipped for college-type teaching.

But the most serious problem is of another kind. There are far too few junior colleges to serve the function for which they are basically designed: to accommodate all the qualified students who want to attend a college.

To make this possible will require broad federal grants of money, plus matching funds put up by states, cities, and local communities. It also will require thousands of scholarships, for a tuition fee of even \$50 per year keeps some students from enrolling.

Americans, compared with most other peoples, have always spent heavily, although not over-generously, on education. And the junior college, with its emphasis on *functional* education, is bound to have a special appeal to most Americans. These facts suggest that a start will be made toward giving the country the junior-college plant that is needed.

The whip-cracker comes from the Boston (Massachusetts) *Globe*, October 12, 1947, in a six-column feature spread with pictures, written by K. S. Bartlett. The boilerplate headline is "How Junior Colleges Work Out in the Bay State." While the feature gives due con-

sideration to the many private junior colleges in Massachusetts, it is pointed toward the emerging public institutions. This is of especial interest because the first letter written by this Executive Secretary in August, 1946, was addressed to the editor of a Boston daily in reply to an editorial to the effect that a junior college was only half a college.

Springfield, Holyoke, and Newton Junior Colleges are given considerable space. The quoted comments from Daniel J. McDevitt, chairman of the Boston School Committee, are interesting and challenging in that he is thoroughly sold on these colleges from observation and reports from other states. He is quoted as saying:

I will present a program for such a college at a meeting of the School Committee soon. This would, in turn, be submitted to the board of school superintendents so that they may report to the committee on the advisability of Boston's setting up a public junior college. The committee would then act for or against the proposal.

I am convinced of the need of such a college in Boston. Many of our high-school graduates, including Boston Latin School graduates, have told me they have been unable to secure admission to four-year colleges this year and that in many cases they have been refused for the collegiate year beginning in the fall of 1948. These are boys and girls well qualified for admission, but there simply isn't room for them. I think we should do something for them.

## Recent Writings

### *Judging the New Books*

*Cooperation in General Education: A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1947. Pp. xvii + 240. \$3.00.

THE publication of this report is an event of no small importance in the unfolding of the general-education movement. Although much has been written and a great deal more has been said in the last two decades about general education, the present study represents, no doubt, the most significant effort to approach the problem on a large scale. In fact, the report itself recognizes the weight that will be attached to its publication:

Indeed, it is not too much to say that the Cooperative Study in General Education constituted the first systematic and co-operative attack upon the myriad problems connected with the development of this movement [p. 202].

The Cooperative Study was authorized in 1938 as a result of the interest of a number of colleges in the improvement of their general-education programs. The General Education Board undertook to support the project for three years

provided a minimum of fifteen institutions took part and supplied funds for approximately one-half of the budget. The task of sponsoring the study was assumed by the American Council on Education, which appointed an executive committee to assume responsibility for the direction of the study. During the period of its operation from January, 1939, to September, 1944, some twenty-five colleges participated, although some of them not for the entire period.

In addition to the present volume, there have been published three other volumes, covering major projects carried on in special fields: *General Education in the Humanities*, *General Education in the Social Studies*, and *Student Personnel Services in General Education*. A projected volume in science was not completed because of the war.

The Study was carried on in a number of ways, including summer workshops at the University of Chicago, intercollege committees, regional conferences, visits by consultants, fellowships for faculty members, and so on. It should be pointed out that the purpose of the Study was not simply to investi-

gate the status of general education but was rather "to effect desirable changes in educational practice. . . . The concern of the study was to be with what *ought* to be done and how it could be effected" (p. vii).

The Study was also organized to "discover and develop leaders in the various faculties who would gain a broader and more realistic perspective of the problems of general education, and who would be capable of putting into operation the programs developed under their leadership" (p. vii). The third purpose was "to provide opportunity for interchange among institutions of the results of their experimentation and study to the end that the results of the study would be made available to all American institutions of higher education" (pp. vii-viii).

The final report of the executive committee not only brings together the significant projects conducted in the various fields noted above but also provides general background material covering the development of, and the issues in, general education. The average junior-college reader will find himself in familiar territory throughout most of the volume and will, no doubt, register sympathetic response to most of what is said.

The writers provide the necessary orientation for their problem by devoting an introductory chapter to the historical background, covering in summary fashion the

well-worn story of the development of American education in the nineteenth century and its failure to adapt itself to the rapidly changing and growing school population of the twentieth century. Those of us who are identified with junior colleges will have little difficulty in accepting this statement concerning the students of today:

What is needed is a high-school and junior-college program of general education which by the end of the Sophomore year will have given them the basic understandings and skills which everyone should possess whether he leaves an academic institution at the end of that period, continues through a full college course, or enters a professional school [p. 17].

The Study proceeds from the historical background of general education to the more specific issues faced by the groups in developing a co-operative enterprise and in improving their own programs of general education. It is obvious that no study of this kind could proceed without first resolving some of the important differences of educational policy. The particular issues considered are the following: (1) education of the few versus education of the many, (2) election versus prescription of courses, (3) training of the intellect versus developing the total personality, and (4) broad transfer of learning versus functional organization.

Co-operative action by faculty members who held various shades

of opinion on both sides of these issues and of others was not easily achieved. To be sure, some of the differences disappeared when the issues were carefully stated and it became apparent that the problem was one of semantics and not of policy. Since the Study was not intended to limit freedom of decision on any issue, the participants sought to reach agreement on proximate goals and immediate steps without violating this freedom. The Study did not resolve the conflicts nor answer these issues at the policy level. Instead, it transformed them into specific issues at the level of practice.

One cannot quarrel with this method of procedure, since it appeared to be the only way in which real co-operation could be achieved and the futility of endless argument be circumvented. However, one can but express disappointment when the Study further disclaims the intention of arriving at generalizations about matters of policy as a result of the study of specific issues.

The Study emphasizes the implications for individual colleges of these basic questions of policy, stating that they must not only consider important issues but also examine and revise their programs in the light of their decisions on these issues. They must also learn how to co-operate with one another for the betterment of American college education. Whatever their differ-

ences, there are wide areas of agreement on the desirable characteristics to be developed in students. The expansion of these areas will make a positive contribution toward that "education for the common life of American democracy which *general* education implies" (p. 51).

The chapter dignified by the title "The Philosophy of the Study" is concerned with the method of procedure adopted. The emphasis is on a clear statement of objectives and an honest attempt to steer the educational program toward their realization. These objectives are stated in terms of desirable student behaviors. The educational need, then, is the extent to which a student falls short of these objectives or behaviors. Although this view is not new, the rather simple techniques suggested may prove practical.

About half of the volume is devoted to a detailed and frequently tedious discussion of the major projects in the humanities, the social studies, science, and student personnel. Descriptions are given of the development of inventories of student needs or attitudes in eight areas: "General Goals of Life," "Fiction," "What Students Think about Art," "Social Understanding," "Beliefs about Postwar Reconstruction," "Health," "Personal-Social Relations," and "Counseling Relations."

The inventory technique is well established, and the uses to which



the results can be put are numerous. The reader will find informative the description of the procedures used in constructing the inventories and will perhaps be encouraged to obtain copies for further study. It is a keen disappointment, however, to find so much of the report devoted to this one aspect of the Study and so little space devoted to the elaboration of some of the individual projects involving methods of instruction, course content, comprehensive examinations, and administrative procedures.

The 100-page discussion of inventories is followed by a chapter justifying and explaining their use. There is no doubt that the inventories served to point up "the principle that the learning experiences to be provided in an effective program of general education must be related to the objectives of the program" (p. 181). However, the reader looking for concrete assistance in constructing the program itself would like to know more about these relevant "learning experiences." There is no doubt that the work on the inventories was of tremendous value to the participants. The authors state:

The effect of the inventories upon the faculty conception of curriculum and evaluation and their usefulness in providing a concrete, working procedure were probably the most important contributions they made [p. 182].

The optimism of this chapter is perhaps warranted and reflects, I am sure, a correct statement of the values that accrued to the groups involved. It is unfortunate that more of the specific results are not elaborated for the use of those who did not participate.

In the next to the last chapter we come to an outline of a program of general education as it may be developed in an individual college:

The logical steps involved in developing a program of general education are clear enough. They consist of (1) formulating the objectives to be attained by a program of general education; (2) selecting content and methods, that is, developing types of learning experiences that when participated in by the students are likely to produce attainment of the objectives; (3) organizing these learning experiences so as to make a coherent and effective program; (4) developing procedures for appraising the achievement of students and thus determining how far the curriculum is working; (5) selecting, counseling, and guiding students so that they may derive the most benefit from the educational program; (6) providing the facilities—both material and personal—that are necessary to carry out the program outlined; and (7) co-ordinating the various parts of the program so that it functions as a unified and effective whole. There may be some debate about the details of these steps and the possible addition of one or two others, but, in general, these are the chief divisions of the task involved in developing a program of general education within a college [p. 184].

Some of these points are given detailed treatment, especially the first, but most of them are dealt with only superficially. An earlier statement of such a program and its careful development, step by step, would have greatly enhanced the practical value of the report for those seeking guidance in formulating their own plans.

The final chapter enumerates a series of conclusions concerning general education, but these are not conclusions based on the evidence brought forth in the Study but are merely "pronouncements of members of a committee that had a unique relationship to the Study" (p. 206). The reader is disappointed to find that the evidence has not resulted in clear-cut conclusions. The observations of the committee, however, summarize some of the best thinking on the subject of general education and are worthy of careful study. Their proposal for a separate department or organization for general education is, no doubt, more applicable to a four-year college than to a junior college. In the latter, general education is more likely to be the concern of the entire staff, most of whom will be sympathetic to such a program and capable of implementing it.

The authors of this report would

probably agree that it might more appropriately be called a "report of progress" than a "final report." It is evident that the Study has made a worth-while and perhaps significant contribution to the general-education movement. The co-operating colleges have derived much benefit from their participation in this project under able leadership. The inventories and the techniques developed will be of inestimable value to others who seek to experiment in the field.

The weaknesses of the report are perhaps inherent in any volume of multiple authorship. The reader is not so much interested in what they did and how they did it as he is in the concrete results arrived at. A disproportionate amount of space is allotted to the complexities of the operation of the Study, with a consequent sacrifice of the conclusions and lessons derived. It is to be hoped that one of the authors will utilize the rich source material hinted at in this volume to prepare a book on general education that will give proper attention to the implementation of a general-education program under a variety of campus conditions.

WALTER J. MOBERG  
*Dean of the Junior College  
and Academy*

NORTH PARK COLLEGE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

## Selected References

S. V. MARTORANA

BOGUE, JESSE P. "A Good Junior College," *Texas Outlook*, XXXI (August, 1947), 22-23, 43.

After emphatically establishing the point that persons interested in the movement are highly optimistic about the future of the junior college, Dr. Bogue proceeds to elaborate on certain criteria believed to be characteristic of good junior colleges. Junior colleges are growing with astonishing rapidity because the people want them. To assist workers in the field to build these institutions on sound principles and practices, the American Association of Junior Colleges is carrying on a program of extensive research. Under the general direction of Dr. Leonard V. Koos, investigations are being conducted in the areas of curriculum, adult education, teacher preparation, student personnel, administration, and legislation affecting junior colleges. It is hoped that the results of this program will aid in the continued improvement of junior-college education.

The primary requisite of a good junior college is superior instruction and the creation of an environment conducive to learning. More than 60 per cent of the students will complete their formal education in the junior college. They are entitled, therefore, to receive the very best instruction and training possible. In addition, the first two years of college work should be offered at standards above those of the average four-year college.

With respect to aims and objectives, junior colleges may have honest and desirable differences. The objectives of both private and public junior colleges may have healthy divergences according to geographical location and the needs of constituencies. Terminal or university-parallel curriculums or both may be offered. Terminal programs of education should be organized on the basis of community needs.

A clear statement of objectives and the

initiation of sound methods of carrying out the objectives are not sufficient. Adequate buildings, ample equipment, and a stable economic policy are essential. Sound financial planning and management is the foundation on which the cultural superstructure of a college must rest. A public institution should have a local tax base broad enough to insure constant and adequate funds without excessive tax rates. Private junior colleges should insure their perpetuity by providing secure endowments and obtaining dependable gifts and contributions from supporting church groups or constituencies.

Early in the history of the junior-college movement, a good junior college was recognized by its ability to counsel and guide its students. The validity of this criterion still obtains. Testing programs, however, can become lopsided. Evaluation must always be linked with practical use.

FOWLKES, JOHN GUY, and AHRNSBRAK, HENRY C. *Junior College Needs in Wisconsin*. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Serial No. 2907, General Series No. 2681. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1947. Pp. 60.

A report of the Committee on Junior College Needs in Wisconsin. Acting on the premise that the people of America have a fundamental belief in education, the need for an investigation of post-high-school educational demands in Wisconsin is posed in this manner: "The question then arises as to what educational facilities are required to provide educational opportunity not only for veterans but also for the increasingly large number of Wisconsin high-school graduates who deserve and need further college education. Therefore, it is clear that Wisconsin must take immediate cognizance of the impending educational load and necessary edu-

cational facilities if its youth are to be served." The bulk of the report is a compilation of statistical data presumably intended to inform the public of the situation which exists, accompanied by suggestions of how junior-college work may be extended throughout the state.

In addition to the University of Wisconsin, the state has ten publicly supported institutions of higher learning (nine teachers' colleges and Stout Institute) offering work at the collegiate level. Five separate and independent boards administer the various institutions of higher learning in the state. Such an organization of higher education has resulted in well-nigh complete lack of co-ordination among the several institutions.

After rather exhaustive analysis of the present and the potential college enrolments in Wisconsin, attention is drawn to the kinds of education and public educational institutions needed. Evidently four basic types of college curriculums should be provided in the state: "(1) liberal terminal—two years immediately following high-school graduation, noncollege; (2) liberal terminal and semi-professional or vocational—two years immediately following high-school graduation, noncollege; (3) college work—Freshman and Sophomore years of a four-year letters and science college; (4) professional—third and fourth years of college work and graduate study."

A junior college is defined as "a two-year institution, admission to which is open to those who have graduated from high school or can show evidence of equivalent training, rendering one or more of the following functions: (1) offers two years of liberal terminal education; (2) offers two years of work which is a combination of liberal and semi-professional or vocational terminal education; (3) offers the Freshman and Sophomore years of work of a four-year letters and science college."

"The criteria for determining the need for, and feasibility of, the successful establishment of junior colleges are as follows:

"1. In general, a junior college should be established only where there is no other institution of collegiate level that can be made

to serve the existing educational needs of the county.

"2. A five-year average of 250 high-school graduates per year.

"3. Forty per cent of the high-school graduates now attending college in all situations where the previous five-year average of high-school graduates does not exceed 500.

"4. A survey of the intentions of high-school Seniors with respect to plans for education beyond high school, including choices of occupations and educational institutions to be attended.

"5. A five-year average of 1,100 students enrolled in the four-year high school.

"6. A five-year average of 1,000 students in average daily attendance in the four-year high school.

"7. A county population of 19,000."

The report recommends the establishment of junior colleges in seven or eight centers where educational opportunities at the level are not now available, the new units to be under the control of the University of Wisconsin.

The major conclusion reached in the report is that the basic educational need of high-school graduates in Wisconsin is for a liberal education extending two years beyond high school. This liberal education may come before or with trade, technical-vocational, semi-professional, or professional training. If a remark may be made in interpretation of the report, it would be that the authors appear to be more concerned with minimum disruption of existing educational institutions and facilities than with establishment of a well-integrated program of educational opportunity for the youth of the state.

HILLWAY, TYRUS. "What Can the Junior College Do?" *School and Society*, LXVI (December 13, 1947), 457-58.

Lauds the junior college as the most flexible institution in the American educational system—a system which is fairly well committed to the idea of variety of educational opportunity to meet the individual needs of all students. No type of institution

has more strikingly demonstrated our interest in the service of all youth.

From an objective, theoretical, and philosophical point of view, however, there is more justification for the increasing popularity and influence of the junior college than the fact that it provides variety in the pattern of higher education. An early argument in favor of the junior college was its usefulness in recruiting students for the standard four-year college and university. Modern educators tend to stress the terminal advantages of the junior-college curriculum. These institutions serve another need by guiding the student to a proper choice between the four-year program and the two-year terminal program.

A less obvious advantage claimed for the junior college is the high quality of teaching that is done there. This is made possible because faculty members devote their major efforts to effective teaching and only incidentally engage in research. There is an additional justification for the junior college which the author believes has thus far escaped public attention. This is the effect on the student of nonacademic activities in the junior-college program. "Perhaps this rather than merely academic achievement is the reason for the comparatively greater success of junior-college transfer students in senior college."

Despite these statements of praise for the junior college, the author concludes: "I do not pretend that all students, or even the majority, should attend the junior college before going farther. I continue to believe that a student who seeks the baccalaureate degree should, under normal circumstances, enter the four-year institution as a Freshman. I hope I have pointed out, however, some reasons for the justification of the junior college in our system of higher education. Much lack of understanding, I am afraid, still exists among our older educators as to what this infant prodigy can do and how it complements rather than duplicates the work of the traditional college and university."

MUSHLITZ, M. E. "Subject Trends in California Public Junior Colleges," *California Journal of Secondary Edu-*

*cation*, XXII (October, 1947), 366-69.

With the need for curriculum development in junior colleges becoming increasingly apparent, especially in the field of terminal education, educators will be interested in the findings of the California State Department concerning current offerings in California junior colleges. Enrolments in regular day classes in these institutions reached an all-time high of 53,318 students in 1946-47. Of this total, 28,737 were veterans, and 24,581 were nonveterans. Completing the junior-college courses were 2,635 veterans and 3,069 nonveterans. Of those graduating, 1,654 veterans and 1,512 nonveterans signified their intentions of continuing at four-year colleges.

Analysis of enrolments in separate classes and subjects reveals a heavy preponderance in university-parallel courses. The junior colleges seem to be giving basic preparation for large numbers of future scientists, engineers, and technical workers.

"Assuming that on the average each full-time student regularly enrolled in junior college was registered for five classes besides physical education, it follows that 16 per cent of the total enrolments of students were in some science work. . . . Chemistry led all sciences by enrolling over 34 per cent; physics was second with over 20 per cent." Worthy of special note is the fact that, of all the sciences, physical sciences which lead directly toward careers in engineering and technical vocations had the largest enrolments. Should this trend continue, junior-college administrators will need to make special provisions to meet it.

Because one of the major functions of junior colleges is the training of students in terminal and vocational courses, the field of commerce usually receives particular emphasis. Approximately 10 per cent of the total junior-college enrolments were in business education. Of all those taking business education, two-thirds were enrolled in secretarial or clerical training and accounting.

The next most popular subject field was mathematics—a fact which reflects the trend toward concentration in sciences. Large proportions of students are taking courses



traditionally considered to be high-school subjects, for example, algebra and plane geometry. When the enrolments in such classes are totaled, 11,520 students, or almost half of the total junior-college enrolment in mathematics, are carrying work at the high-school level while attending junior college. This fact would seem to indicate that junior colleges are continuing to serve as adjustment areas for maturing students, who often change their vocational or professional aims.

Class enrolments in foreign languages totaled 16,280. If it is again assumed that each student is enrolled in five separate classes on the average, more than 6 per cent of the student enrolments were in foreign languages. Of this percentage, French had nearly one-fourth of the language students; German, one-fifth; Spanish, more than half; and Latin, 3 per cent. The greatest number of language courses given in any one junior college was six.

Class enrolments in homemaking were disappointing. Assuming again that, on the average, each student is enrolled in five separate classes and that half of the students are women, only about 4 per cent of the women enrolled in junior-college classes were studying homemaking. Of these, 27 per cent were in clothing classes, over 15 per cent in foods, and almost 10 per cent in classes devoted to preparation for marriage.

Of other subject fields, music was the most popular, with more than 4 per cent of the total in classes enrolled in its various areas. Arts and crafts enrolled more than 3.5 per cent of the students. Thirteen colleges offered courses in aviation, enrolling 0.5 per cent of all junior-college classes. Such classes as cosmetology, forestry, dentistry, voice transcription, and journalism had small enrolments and were found in few schools. The article is summarized by a tabular presentation of 1946-47 enrolments in regular classes.

PRINGLE, HENRY F., and PRINGLE, KATHERINE. "Is Education Getting Too Big?" *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXX (September 6, 1947), 30-31, 142, 144, 146, 148.

Presented in terms of the University of California, the largest in the world, the "ap-

palling" problems confronting all large universities are discussed. In February, 1947, faculty representatives of the University of California convened to discuss the faults and virtues of their institution. There was little disagreement on the basic problem now confronting higher education in the United States. "This is the degree to which boys and girls, unqualified in mentality and training for university education, are demanding admission. It is not true, although frequently stated, that the educational benefits of the G.I. Bill of Rights are primarily responsible for the universal congestion. Mass education had become an almost unmanageable giant before the war."

A partial solution, suggested by President Robert Gordon Sproul, intimates a limited function for junior colleges. "More definite restrictions should be placed on university admissions. . . . Junior-college systems should be expanded to provide 'opportunities for those not qualified to work on the university level.'" To this, it is stated, most university heads would agree, although probably not publicly.

Three conditions are cited as specific problems confronting university educators. Of primary importance is the lack of classroom, study-hall, library, and dormitory space. If possible at all, real study is made difficult by overcrowding. Unusual increases in enrolments have also caused deterioration in the quality of instruction. Staff increases have been constant, and the huge courses are broken down into smaller sections, which meet with younger instructors. The third criticism, namely, that the curriculum offerings are too specialized, is not directly related to recent enrolment expansion. It is, nevertheless, a matter of major concern.

As a solution, a faculty committee of the University of California at Los Angeles, recommended "'a return to the traditional pattern of the American liberal college.' That is to say, all students would be required to take specified basic courses, covering related subjects, with many fewer electives than have been allowed in the past."

At the faculty conference President Sproul told his colleagues that education is planned too particularly for those who aspire to the

professions and to management or who are adept at book learning. "He offered his conviction that more opportunities should be offered for boys and girls who want training for industry or trade, or who desire merely 'a more-rounded general education.' This can be done only by the establishment of more and better junior and state colleges, not more universities."

The answer to conceded imperfections of present-day university programs most favored by the authors is the small college. In meeting the need for more general education, only a limited function is granted the junior college. More confidence is placed in a college patterned after the traditional small, liberal arts institution. Recently acquired by the University of California, Santa Barbara College, which had for years been a state college emphasizing the industrial arts, is being used as a laboratory specimen. "The bright hopes of those who call for change are that it shall be a Williams College or a Dartmouth of the West."

## AMERICAN COLLEGE BUREAU

28 E. JACKSON  
BOULEVARD  
CHICAGO

A Bureau of Placement which limits its work to the university and college field. It is affiliated with the Fisk Teachers Agency of Chicago, whose work covers all the educational fields. Both organizations assist in the appointment of administrators as well as of teachers.

*Our service is nation wide*

## The University of Denver

announces

## A JUNIOR COLLEGE SEMINAR

July 26 to August 27

The Seminar features *practical study* and *recognized leadership* for junior college instructors and administrators.

**July 26-30.** *Current Problems and Trends; General Education*—Dr. Jesse P. Bogue, Executive Secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges.

**August 2-6.** *Problems in Student Personnel Programs*—Dr. Daniel D. Feder, Dean of Students University of Denver. President, Council of Guidance Associations.

**August 9-13.** *Vocational and Terminal Education*—Dr. Leo F. Smith, Director, Educational Research, Rochester Institute of Technology.

**August 16-20.** *State, Local, and National Organization and Administration*—Dr. Roscoe Ingalls, Director, East Los Angeles Junior College.

**August 23-27.** *Junior Colleges and Implications of the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.* Dr. Henry Dixon, President, Weber College, Member of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

Our flexible enrollment plan permits attendance from one to five weeks. There are two two-hour classes daily.

The University of Denver's Summer Quarter offers an ideal opportunity for study and recreation in cool Colorado.

*For complete information write*

**The Director, Summer Quarter**

University of Denver  
Denver 10, Colorado

# NEW—A COLLEGE TEXTBOOK

*for your first course in business*

## ★ INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS ★

By Dr. R. E. Glos and Dr. H. A. Baker

"Already used in more than 100 colleges and universities."

Here is a book that is rich in content. It helps the student to see the relationship of every element in our business system. It presents a survey of business principles, problems, practices, and procedures. It not only provides a background for the specialized business courses, but it also helps students to select fields of specialization and to build a vocabulary for their other courses. It provides real groundwork on which the rest of the business curriculum can be based.



**SOUTH-WESTERN PUBLISHING CO.**

*Specialists in Business and Economic Education*

CINCINNATI • NEW YORK • CHICAGO • SAN FRANCISCO • DALLAS

## Journal of Higher Education

**THE MAGAZINE FOR  
LEADERS IN COLLEGIATE  
EDUCATION**

**Subscription \$4 a year**

**OHIO STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**COLUMBUS**

For the past seventeen years the Journal has been recognized as the leading magazine devoted to matters pertaining to the different areas of higher education. The contents of each issue are varied. The prospectus for the year's issues contains discursive articles, reports of research, and criticisms of current practices. We believe that professors and administrative officers, when once subscribers to the Journal, will find it so satisfying that they will not wish to be without it.